

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHEN our Lord said, 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me,' what did He mean? Did He mean that it was just the same as if we had done it to Him, He being so much concerned for His brethren?

MR. A. CLUTTON-BROCK says no. It is much more than that. What we do to one of these His brethren we literally do to Him. We cannot isolate an act. We cannot say to it, 'Thus far shalt thou go and no farther.' And it is not merely that every act has consequences. Of course it has, consequences which are incalculable. It is that every separate act is an inseparable act. If it touches one of the least of these it touches them all. It touches the universal brotherhood. It touches—and this is the point at present—it touches the universal Brother.

MR. CLUTTON-BROCK has written a book about Christianity. *Studies in Christianity* he calls it (Constable; 4s. 6d. net). He has written it for the purpose of telling us what Christianity is. And no one will be surprised that it takes a fairly large book to do that. He never runs Christianity into a definition. He expects us to read his book. But once he comes near to a statement of what Christianity is, so near that we shall quote it.

The statement is: 'Man is born within a natural order in which he is governed by his instinct for self-preservation; but it is possible for him to rise out of that natural order into another order in which he is no longer governed by his instinct of self-preservation but by his relation with a power above humanity, yet personal; and he attains to this relation, which is love, by the help of that power, a help which is called the Grace of God.'

MR. CLUTTON-BROCK does not call that a definition of Christianity. He calls it 'the doctrine of the Grace of God.' But we can see that the doctrine of the Grace of God is for him—is it not for us also?—that which makes Christianity what it is. And we see that its secret is love. For the Grace of God is the Love of God in exercise. And what it works in us is love, love to God and man.

It is not surprising therefore, when Mr. CLUTTON-BROCK speaks of what we do to Christ's brethren, that he should select loving them as the example.

There are two things, he says, which we have discovered about loving. The one is that, if we love at all, we must love the particular. We must love *one* of these. The other is that when we love the particular we love the universal. We do not lose the love of the particular in the universal.

The more intensely we love one of these, the more intensely we love Him.

And so it comes to pass that if we are to love Christ at all we must love one at least, and one of the least, of these His brethren. The little one is not Christ; he is himself. And we love him for himself. Yet in loving him for himself, and only then, we love Christ. He prayeth best who loveth best. Does he pray at all who does not love? As St. John has it, If we love not our brother whom we see, how *can* we love God whom we do not see?

Here then are two things about loving. First, if we love the little one we love the Great One. 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, ye did it unto me.' And next, unless we love the little one we do not love the Great One. 'Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me.'

In discussing the question of the teaching of Religion in schools, we seem to be concerned only with what we teach. Mr. E. T. CAMPAGNAC believes that what we teach is of much less consequence than how we teach it. As Professor of Education in the University of Liverpool, he delivered five lectures on the teaching of religion. These lectures have been published. The title is *Elements of Religion and Religious Teaching* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 3s. net).

Professor CAMPAGNAC told those whom he addressed, and who were in training as teachers, that if they were to teach religion they must first be themselves religious. Why should men or women be teachers at all? To satisfy the curiosity of children? To give them information? To tell them that two and two makes four, that the world is shaped like an orange, that the names of the kings of Israel were Jeroboam and the rest? We give too much information. 'Be very sparing of your knowledge,' he said; 'do not tell your pupils too much.' But, tell them much or

tell them little, this is not education. It is not in order to impart knowledge that men and women become teachers.

'I think there is only one good excuse for teaching, and it is this, that you have for the thing which you want to teach so strong an affection and in it so fervent a belief that you cannot be silent about it, and for the people whom you have to meet in the course of your business so kindly a feeling—a feeling so intimate of kindred and of affection—that you cannot help talking to them about the things you care for. That is the only excuse for teaching. Otherwise all teaching is an intrusion.'

Especially is the teaching of religion an intrusion. If, in order to teach mathematics, you must believe in mathematics, that is to say, be mathematical; much more in order to teach religion, must you be religious. 'Why should you disturb the placid lives of children, why should you disturb the gaiety of youth, by telling the children or youths things you do not care much for, while all the time you do not care much for your unwilling listeners?'

Now religion is a venture. The religious man is one who 'has risked the things he sees for the sake of the things he does not see—the safe for the unsafe, the paying for the things that do not pay, the tangible for the intangible—that is the religious man.'

He is not a perfect example. 'He has a high strung nature and irritable nerves, and a sharp tongue—he has a thousand faults, but he has got, with all that, a fund of tranquillity which nothing destroys. He may go from extremes of joy to extremes of sadness—he is not overturned by either. He is like a well-balanced ship which, tossed by the waves, will not turn right over, because it has ballast. At the heart of emotion, however varied, he has tranquillity—that is one of the marks of a religious person.'

'Another of his marks is this: he is persistent. He will be baffled, discouraged, tormented with the opposition of the world and the inconsistencies of his own nature, but he will go on and on, and he will still go on. He counts in the long run because his influence is persistent.'

That is the man who can teach religion. 'If,' says Professor CAMPAGNAC, 'you tell me that your business is to teach religion, I should say, "Be religious, maintain this tranquillity, keep this persistence."' The religious man is not perfect as an example, but if he has tranquillity and persistence he will carry 'conviction to other minds, not in all he does, but in the main tenor of what he does, that he is somehow representative—he is himself, of course, but he is representative of more than himself. He speaks with the tradition of all truly religious people behind him; he speaks with the weight of their authority. He has penetrated into lonely places, which are yet, as he finds, strangely inhabited by other lonely creatures like himself, held together in communion with a presence of which his life becomes the imperfect, but the tranquil, the persistent and in its persistent tranquillity, the invincible, witness.'

The aim of all true teaching is to make the pupils what the teacher is. It is to make them mathematical if he is mathematical. If he is a teacher of art it is to make them artistic. And so is it in the teaching of religion. The aim of the teacher of religion, and his only aim, is to make his pupils religious.

But the teacher of religion has a peculiar difficulty to overcome. All other teachers can furnish proofs of their teaching. If it is true teaching, they can show that it is true. Every proposition in Euclid is a demonstration. Even the artist has some evidence in favour of his art. But the teacher of religion has no proofs to offer. Religion is a venture. It is a hypothesis. When your pupils ask for proofs all that you can say is that 'what you have been claiming is a great hypothesis;

your working theory, an assumption which you make, and that you cannot prove the truth of your assumption to other persons except upon the condition upon which you proved it to yourself, namely, that they make the assumption too. You cannot convince another that what you taste and enjoy is good if he refuses to taste and enjoy it.'

And 'the difficulty is not disposed of by that. Suppose they say to you that they are glad to hear that you are candid enough to admit that all this is a hypothesis—it is your hypothesis, a very pleasant hypothesis, very comforting and even useful, "but," they will go on, "it will break down; it maintains you now, but not for ever will it maintain you." What answer is there to that?'

'The only answer to that is the answer which courage draws from the heart of love, namely, that you will risk it. One can and ought to try to anticipate the results of experience. You must make your risk and then see whether the risk has been justified. You cannot get the justification first and make the risk afterwards—there would be no risk. For faith is a venture—the faith which we repose in other people, the faith we repose in ourselves, the faith we repose in God. And a man who says to himself, "I will have my proof first, and repose my faith afterwards," is a man who is saying he will do what is impossible.'

We have to realize that there is a risk. And we have to make others realize it. More than that, 'a hypothesis made once is a hypothesis to be made again and again; it is not a certainty in advance; you leap in the dark, and all leaps that are worth taking are in the dark; whether you arrive upon a jagged rock, or a pitiless sea, or in a haven where you would be, remains to find out, and a courageous man, whether religious or scientific, or scientific and religious both, makes that venture: and if a hypothesis often made and confirmed induces security, he finds new exercise

for his courage by making a new and still bolder venture.'

The Rev. Edwin A. ABBOTT, D.D., delivered a lecture before the British Academy on '*Righteousness*' in the Gospels, which has been published by Mr. Humphrey Milford at the Oxford University Press (1s. net).

'Righteousness'—it is a Biblical word. 'Shakespeare never uses it; nor does Pope or Shelley. When it is used by Milton, Cowper, and Wordsworth it is tinged with ecclesiastical or theological associations, which remain to this day, so that even now, when we enumerate the good qualities of some friend, we cannot—without some sense of unreality—speak of his "righteousness." We may praise his "justice," but that is a narrower thing. We may praise his "goodness," but that is a vaguer thing. We may praise his "kind-heartedness," but that is a different thing. We have no English noun corresponding to that noble use of the Greek adjective which we find in Plato: "God is as righteous as is possible [for divine nature], and there is nothing more like God than a human being that is as righteous as is possible [for human nature]."'

But though Biblical, it is not found everywhere throughout the Bible, or even throughout the Gospels. Rather is its occurrence peculiar and quite perplexing. It does not occur at all in St. Mark. In St. Matthew it occurs very often, but only in the words of Christ. In St. Luke it occurs nowhere in the words of Christ, not even in parallels to St. Matthew, and only once elsewhere. The single occurrence is in the Song of Zacharias: 'that we should serve him [the Lord] without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all our days.' In St. John also it is found only once. The passage is an important and difficult one. Jesus in His last discourse says that when the Paraclete is come He 'will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgement.'

The word in the New Testament which is translated 'righteousness' is used by the Seventy. Its first occurrence in the Septuagint is in Gn 15⁶, where it is said of Abraham that he 'believed God and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness.' 'The same Hebrew is repeated twice in Deuteronomy, "It shall be *righteousness unto us* if we observe to do all this commandment *before the Lord our God*," and, more particularly, "Thou shalt surely restore to him [*i.e.* the needy borrower] the pledge when the sun goeth down, that he may sleep in his garment and bless thee: and it shall be *righteousness unto thee before the Lord thy God*." In all these passages,' says Dr. ABBOTT, 'the "righteousness" is regarded as "*reckoned*" unto some one ("him," "us," "thee") even where "*reckoned*" is omitted. It is also "*before God*," that is to say, as seen by the eyes of God, who sees the truth.'

But in Deuteronomy the same Hebrew word, translated by the Seventy in Genesis *dikaïosunê* or righteousness, means 'charity,' in the sense of 'charitable alms'; and that meaning occurs sometimes in the Psalms, in Isaiah, and in Daniel. It is thus clear that, as Hooker says, 'there are two kinds of Christian righteousness, the one without us, which we have by imputation; the other in us, which consisteth of faith, hope, charity, and other Christian virtues.' As Dr. ABBOTT has shown in the passages in Genesis where it occurs, 'righteousness' is reckoned or imputed, but in Deuteronomy and other places of the Old Testament it is a matter of conduct, and is translated in the Septuagint *eleemosunê* or almsgiving. How is it with the Gospels?

The first occurrence of the word in St. Matthew's Gospel is in Mt 3¹⁵, and there is not a more difficult occurrence anywhere, with the single exception of the single occurrence in St. John. Jesus comes to the Baptist to be baptized by him. 'The prophet expostulates, saying, "I have need to be baptized by thee." But Jesus replies, "Suffer [it] now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil *all righteous-*

ness." What is meant by "it becometh" as distinct from "it is needful"? And does "us" (instead of "me") mean the Baptist and Jesus, or "all Israel of whom I am one"? And how can the reception of baptism, which is not prescribed either by the Law of Moses or by the Law of Nature, come under the head of a "fulfilling" of "all righteousness"?

These questions have been answered divergently from the very beginning. Not every early expositor even attempted an answer. 'Ignatius writes that Jesus Christ "was baptized by John in order that all righteousness might be fulfilled by Him"—asserting in the same sentence that He was "*truly* from the race of David . . . Son of God . . . *truly* born of a virgin . . . *truly* nailed [to the cross]"—as if protesting (against the Docetics) that there was "*truly*" some objective "righteousness" that was to be "fulfilled" by the baptism. But he does not tell us what it was. Origen says, "Christ Himself is related to have been baptized by John, not with that baptism which is in Christ (Rom. vi. 3), but with that which is in the Law. For so He Himself says to John, 'Suffer it now . . . all righteousness.' Whereby He shows that the baptism of John was a fulfilment of the ancient things (*expletio veterum*), not a beginning of the new things (*inchoatio novorum*). On the other hand, Jerome says that Jesus refrained from adding the nature of the righteousness—whether it was the righteousness of the Law or the righteousness of Nature—for the express purpose of making us understand that it meant both. But he, too, does not explain how the acceptance of baptism "fulfilled" either kind of righteousness. Chrysostom says, "How is it 'becoming'? Because we are thereby fulfilling the whole Law. . . . For 'righteousness' is the complete fulfilment of the commandments [of the Law]."

Dr. ABBOTT prefers Origen. "The Baptist, the last of the prophets, was making a final prophetic attempt to put new life into the fulfilment of the righteousness of the old Law, and Jesus, while

awaiting further revelation, said that it was "becoming" or "seemly" for all Israel to join in this attempt "for the present" (R.V. "now"), although He anticipated that it would be insufficient.'

The next two occurrences are in the Sermon on the Mount, and they are remarkable, not so much for their own sake as for their total omission by St. Luke. The parallels are:

MT 5^{6, 10}.

LK 6²¹.

Blessed are they that	Blessed are ye that
hunger and thirst after	hunger now.
righteousness.	

Blessed are they that	Luke omits.
have been persecuted	
for the sake of <i>righteous-</i>	
<i>ness.</i>	

Dr. ABBOTT discusses the matter at some length. He does not think that St. Matthew altered St. Luke or that St. Luke altered St. Matthew. He believes that both had access to originals, not to one original only but to two, a Manual and a Biographical Collection of Logia. And he concludes: 'We are justified in believing that Matthew is not amplifying, or summarizing out of his own head, but is adding a longer and more poetic version taken from the Logia. Luke, on the other hand, if he is not here himself abridging and summarizing, is taking his version from the Manual. This may well have seemed to him more practical and comforting to Missionaries, more true to experience and history, and more intelligible to Gentiles.'

'The next two instances use "righteousness" in a technical sense for "almsgiving." "*Your righteousness*," says Jesus to His disciples, must exceed "*the righteousness of the Pharisees*," and "Take heed that ye do not *your righteousness* (A.V. alms) before men to be seen by them." Why does Luke nowhere insert these surely very needful warnings? Perhaps because of their technicality. At all events he inserts a non-

technical parable directed against those who "trusted in themselves that they were *righteous* and despised others." They are typified by a Pharisee praying by the side of a Publican. The Pharisee says, "God, I thank thee that I am not as the rest of men . . . or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week. I give tithes of all that I get." The Publican says, "God, be merciful to me a sinner." Luke adds, as the comment of Jesus, "I say unto you, This man went down to his house *made righteous*"—that is, *beheld as righteous by God*—"rather than the other."

The remaining passages in St. Matthew may be passed over that we may come to St. John. Jesus has been speaking of the Holy Ghost the Comforter. 'He has promised them a Paraclete to take His place, being (as it were) His Second Self, the Spirit of Truth. And now He says, "And he [the Paraclete], when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of *righteousness*, and of judgement . . . of *righteousness* because I go to the Father and ye behold me no more" (Jn 16⁸⁻¹⁰).'

How is the Spirit of Truth to convict the world in respect of righteousness? Dr. ABBOTT'S view is new to us. He says, and says rightly, that there is no thought at all of the Jewish righteousness of the Law, even in its broadest sense, much less in the sense of almsgiving. And then he says: 'It is a personification. The Father looks down from heaven to men on earth and sends His Paraclete to ask them, "Where is my Righteousness, whom I sent down to live among you, and to make you righteous?" And men, convicted and ashamed, are regarded as compelled to reply, "We did not love, we rejected, we cast out, Thy Righteousness, because we ourselves were unrighteous." Thus will the Paraclete "convict the world," or constrain the world to convict itself, "in respect of righteousness."'

He offers an illustration. 'The picture bears some resemblance to that of Astraea, the goddess

of Justice, who lived on earth during the Golden Age, but was finally forced to depart to her home in heaven, banished by the injustice of men. Or it might be illustrated by the story of Aristides the Righteous, banished from Athens because the Athenians were tired of hearing him called righteous. But what is probably in the Evangelist's mind is the thought of a sad reversal of the glorious prospect depicted in the Psalms: "Truth springeth out of the earth, and righteousness hath looked down from heaven." How different was the prospect now! "Truth," or "the Spirit of Truth," is a title of the Paraclete, and instead of "springing out of the earth," the Paraclete will come down to convict the earth! "Righteousness," also, instead of "looking down from heaven" to bless the inhabitants of earth, is on the point of being banished to heaven, as an exile from the unrighteous earth.'

What is Mysticism? The question is not asked as if it were a novelty. It has been asked before. It is asked now because it has not yet been answered, and because it has just been asked again by Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH, King Edward VII. Professor of English Literature in the University of Cambridge.

'What is Mysticism?'

There the question stands, in a paragraph by itself, prominent on the page of Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH'S new book, *Studies in Literature* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 10s. 6d. net). Now when such a man asks such a question so ostentatiously there is hope that he has found an answer.

But shall we be able to receive it? For Mysticism is something which not every one can understand. Johnson could not understand it. He 'had small care or capacity to understand it.' Shakespeare did not understand it. Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH says so. He says, 'You may choose your grandest passage from Shakespeare: choose Prospero's cloud-capped towers and

gorgeous palaces; or choose Cleopatra's wail upon dead Antony:

O! wither'd is the garland of the war,
The soldier's pole is fall'n; young boys and girls
Are level now with men; the odds is gone,
And there is nothing left remarkable
Beneath the visiting moon.

Then set beside it a line or two of Blake:

When the stars threw down their spears,
And water'd heaven with their tears. . . .

or

A Robin Redbreast in a cage
Puts all heaven in a rage. . . .

or Wordsworth's *Ode to Duty*:

Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong;
And the most ancient heavens, through Thee,
are fresh and strong. . . .

and you will perceive that there are more things in heaven and earth than find their way into great Shakespeare's philosophy; and in particular a something which Plato had known, which Shakespeare did not know, which therefore had to be rediscovered by poets, wise men and children.'

What is Mysticism? You do not understand yet? Then follow the Professor of English Literature at Cambridge further. He refers to previous lectures with 'sundry scattered tenets,' as 'things dropped disconnectedly, casually, on occasion.' Now 'I shall try (if you will allow the simile) to piece these scraps of glass together into a small window through which you may not only, as I hope, have a glimpse into the true meaning of "Mysticism," but even perhaps, into the last meaning of poetry. Oh yes!—a most presumptuous hope most presumptuously uttered. But we have to do our best.'

Well, first of all, the Mystic sees that *the Universe is not a Chaos but a Harmony*. This vision, however, is not peculiar to the Mystic. All great thinkers have made this discovery. It

conditions all their thinking. For 'if the Universe were a chaos, which is anarchy—if the sun rose unpunctually and lay down when it felt inclined, if no moon commanded the tides, if the stars were peevish, running to and fro like spoilt children—any connected thought would be impossible and we no better but worse than blind men jostled about by a crowd.'

Does the harmony of the Universe demand God? Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH does not say so. At least he does not say so yet. It is true that in the very next sentence he says that 'whatever it be, watching over Israel, it slumbers not nor sleeps,' and quotes first from Job and then from Ecclesiasticus. From Job:

'Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?'

'Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season? or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons?'

And from Ecclesiasticus:

'The beauty of heaven, the glory of the stars, an ornament giving light in the highest places of the Lord.'

'At the commandment of the Holy One they will stand in their order, and never faint in their watches.'

But it is clear that he does not want to commit himself at once to the demand for a personal 'Creator, Preserver, and bountiful Benefactor'; for he proceeds to quote from Meredith, a quotation which ends with 'the army of unalterable law.' Then he passes to 'the music of the spheres':

Sit, Jessica, Look . . .

There's not the smallest orb which thou behold'st

But in his motion like an angel sings,
Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubins.

And—'You remember in Plato the story of Er the Pamphylian, whose relatives after ten days sought his dead body on the battle-field, and found it without taint of corruption: and how on the

twelfth day, being laid on the pyre, he came back to life and told them where he had wandered in the other world, and what seen: but chiefly of the great spindle on the knees of Necessity, reaching up to heaven and turning in eight whorls of graduated speed—"and on the rim of each sits a Siren, who revolves with it, hymning a single note; the eight notes together forming one harmony."

'Plato learned of Pythagoras, Dante of Plato, Chaucer of Dante, Milton of Plato again. Hearken, to Milton:

Then listen I
To the celestial Sirens' harmony
That sit upon the nine infolded spheres
And sing to those that hold the vital shears,
And turn the adamantine spindle round
On which the fate of gods and men is wound.
Such sweet compulsion doth in music lie,
To lull the daughters of Necessity,
And keep unsteady Nature to her law,
And the low world in measured motion draw
After the heavenly tune.'

Unalterable law, the music of the spheres, the celestial Sirens' harmony—he has not found it necessary yet to call in God. But he finds it necessary now to call in man.

For the next step in the understanding of Mysticism is to see that 'this macrocosm of the Universe, with its harmony, cannot be apprehended at all except as it is focussed upon the eye, intellect and soul of Man, the microcosm. All systems of philosophy—from the earliest analysed in "Ritter and Preller" down to James and Bergson—inevitably work out to this, that the universal harmony is meaningless and nothing to man save in so far as he can apprehend it, and that he can apprehend it only by reference to some corresponding harmony in himself.'

'He is, let us repeat the admission—You are, I am—but the million-millionth atom of a speck. None the less that atom, being sentient, is reflec-

tive: being reflective, draws and contracts the whole into its tiny ring. Impercipient, what were we, but dead things?

Rolled round in earth's diurnal course,
With rocks, and stones, and trees.

Percipient—solely by the grace of percipience, we are inheritors of it all, and kings. To quote one of the poets, Traherne:

But little did the infant dream
That all the treasures of the world were by:
And that himself was so the cream
And crown of all which round about did lie.
Yet thus it was: the Gem,
The Diadem,
The ring enclosing all
That stand upon this earthly ball,
The Heavenly eye,
Much wider than the sky,
Wherein they all included were,
The glorious Soul, that was the King
Made to possess them, did appear
A small and little thing!'

First then a Universe, cosmical, harmonious, apprehensible and to be depended on. Next the pupil of your eye or mine threaded to a brain infinitesimal and yet infinitely capable of apprehending that harmony and depending on it. What is the third step? It is that this little soul of man aspires, instinctively aspires, yearns to know the greater harmony, if only to render it a more perfect obedience; and that it aspires, yearns, through a sense of likeness, of oneness, of sonship.

Aspires, yearns—after what? After likeness, says Sir Arthur QUILLER-ROUCH, after oneness. And that may be likeness to, oneness with, the Universe. But sonship? For he says the soul of man yearns through a sense of sonship. That cannot be to the Universe. It is true that Sir Arthur still uses 'it'—'man nurses a native impulse to merge himself in the greater harmony and be one with it.' But at once he adds, 'a spirit in his heart (as the Scripture puts it) "of adoption

whereby we cry Abba, Father.” And then he quotes Browning, and Browning and Scripture settle it. ‘Open your Browning,’ he says, ‘and read Johannes Agricola’—and find God :

There’s heaven above, and night by night
 I look right through its gorgeous roof;
 No suns and moons though e’er so bright
 Avail to stop me; splendour-proof
 I keep the broods of stars aloof,
 For I intend to get to God,
 For ’tis to God I speed so fast,
 For in God’s breast, my own abode,
 Those shoals of dazzling glory, passed,
 I lay my spirit down at last.
 I lie where I have always lain,
 God smiles as he has always smiled;
 Ere suns and moons could wax and wane,
 Ere stars were thunder-girt, or piled
 The heavens, God thought on me, his child.

What is Mysticism? It is the sense of sonship to God, the God of this Universe of order and harmony, of which we ourselves are part.

Then comes the question: Can any one be a Mystic?—the personal question: Can I? Sir Arthur QUILLER-OUCH answers that you may be a Mystic. You are a mystic, if you have the power of apprehension. He puts it this way: ‘There are certain men, granted to dwell among us, of more delicate mental texture than their fellows; men (often in the rough-and-tumble unhappy therefore) whose minds have, as it were, exquisite filaments to intercept, *apprehend* and conduct stray messages between the outer mystery of the Universe and the inner mystery of the individual soul; even as telegraphy has learnt to snatch stray messages wandering over waste waters of ocean. And these men are poets.’

These men, he says, are poets. But that need not trouble us. He does not limit the name of poet to those who write verse. It is more disturbing that he says the Mystics are of more delicate

mental texture than their fellows. But we can get over even that. For as soon as he has told us that the Mystic is a poet and of more delicate mental texture than his fellows, he proceeds to tell us how any one whatever with the right will may apprehend, and with such apprehending become a Mystic.

For spirit attracts spirit as surely as matter attracts matter. It is by having the spirit of poetry that we appreciate poetry. It is by being like them that we apprehend a spiritual truth in Dante, Shakespeare, or Tolstoy. It is by being like the Universe, this harmonious Universe, and the God of it, that we can be Mystics. And the closer the likeness the better the Mystic. One with God and the Universe we are Mystics indeed. ‘You may not agree with me,’ says the Cambridge Professor of English Literature, ‘that here lies the deepest secret of poetry: but I present it to you as a historical fact that here lies the central tenet of the Mystics. Man and the Universe and God are in nature One: Unity (if we can find it) runs through all diversities and harmonises them. Therefore to know anything of God Himself we must be, to that extent, like God.’

Is that all? Oh no. Sir Arthur QUILLER-OUCH knows very well that you will still ask him how. And he has his answer. Now remember that he is Professor of Literature, not of Theology. If he gives a wrong answer you will not excuse him therefor. But if he gives the right answer you will rejoice. And he gives it.

First he says: ‘Man has in him—I will not say a “subliminal self”—but a soul listening within for a message; so fain to hear that sometimes it must arise and tip-toe to the threshold:

News from a foreign country came
 As if my treasure and my wealth lay there;
 So much it did my heart inflame,
 ’Twas wont to call my Soul into mine ear;
 Which thither went to meet
 The approaching sweet,

And on the threshold stood
 To entertain the unknown Good.
 It hover'd there
 As if 'twould leave mine ear,
 And was so eager to embrace
 The joyful tidings as they came,
 'Twould almost leave its dwelling-place
 To entertain that same.

And then he says that 'the news comes from without, in its own good time and often in guise totally surprising, like the Messiah:

They all were looking for a king
 To slay their foes and lift them high:
 Thou cam'st, a little baby thing,
 That made a woman cry.'

You must await the hour, he says, 'and trust the invitation, neither of which you may command. The poets do not read the Word by rigorous striving and learning, as your philosophers do: neither, like the priests of Baal, do they cut themselves and yell. Nor do they wrestle with God like Jacob; but wait, prepare themselves with Mary, and say, "Be it unto me according to thy word." They wait, in what one of them has called "a wise passiveness":

The eye—it cannot choose but see;
 We cannot bid the ear be still;
 Our bodies feel, where'er they be,
 Against or with our will.

Not less I deem that there are Powers
 Which of themselves our minds impress;
 That we can feed this mind of ours
 In a wise passiveness.

Think you, 'mid all this mighty sum
 Of things for ever speaking,
 That nothing of itself will come,
 But we must still be seeking?'

Yes, we must still be seeking. But what hope in that? It would not be well with us if that were all. That is not all. The greatest and the best is the last thing in the exposition of Mysticism. *God is always seeking us.*

It must be so. For if the 'Universe be an ordered harmony, and the soul of man a tiny lesser harmony, vibrating to it, yearning to it, seeking to be one with it: if, again, of recollection it knows itself to *have been* at some time one with it, though now astray upon earth, a lost province of the Kingdom of God; why, then, it follows that the King himself passionately seeks to recover, to retrieve, that which was lost.'

And we find it is so in literature as in life. 'The idea of a Christ bruising his feet endlessly over stony places insatiate in search of lost Man, his brother, or the lost Soul, his desired bride, haunts all our mystical poetry from that lovely fifteenth-century poem *Quia Amore Languo*, down to Francis Thompson's *Hound of Heaven*.' And then Sir Arthur quotes out of 'a small innominate poem' of the seventeenth century:

My blood so red
 For thee was shed,
 Come home again, come home again;
 My own sweet heart, come home again!
 You've gone astray
 Out of your way,
 Come home again, come home again!

'There was War in Heaven.'

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., FORMERLY MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY in his message to the nation, dated 26th July, suggested that on Sunday, 4th August, the fourth anniversary of the beginning of the great war, 'the nation in all its parts should join in a solemn act of worship and in thankful remembrance of our brothers and sisters who have made the supreme sacrifice in the cause of righteousness and honour.' And he added this exhortation: 'On an occasion without parallel in the range of its significance let our action as a Christian people be whole-hearted and reverent in purpose, thoughtful in its self-surrender, firm and expectant in its resolve.'

If we are to make a profitable use of these aids to future conduct, we must have clear ideas as to the end which we have in view. The most excellent guides will be of little use to us, if we are still undecided as to the direction in which we are going, and the goal which we desire to reach. Until those points are settled, whole-hearted purpose and firm resolve will be impossible; and self-surrender will simply be thrown away. Are we clear as to the answer to two fundamental questions? Is war between Christian nations necessary and therefore lawful? If it is, are we sure that in this war our cause is, what the Archbishop calls it, 'the cause of righteousness and honour'?

'There was war in heaven.' If on the authority of the inspired writer of the Apocalypse we accept that statement as true, we shall perhaps feel less amazement and perplexity at what we know from the dire experience of the last four years to be a fact, that there is war on earth. Not that our amazement and perplexity are thereby made to cease; but they are to some extent lessened. If for some reason God allows war in heaven, there is likely to be good reason for the existence of war in other parts of His dominion.

It has sometimes been supposed that this war in heaven refers to the primeval rebellion of Satan in some unknown crisis before the Creation of the world. Whatever St. John may have meant by it, it is absolutely certain that he did not mean that. The whole context shows that, not only has the Creation taken place, but the Son of God has been born of a woman, has shed His blood for

mankind, and has returned to glory. This war in heaven is the result of an attempt to dethrone the exalted Christ (see Swete, *ad loc.*); and the fact of such a conflict shows that even in the highest spiritual spheres war cannot always be avoided.

Leaving this mystery, let us consider the subject which concerns us to-day—war upon earth; the greatest and most awful war that has ever been waged. Its magnitude is beyond the grasp of our comprehension, and its horrors baffle the powers of our imagination. Even those who have taken part in a great deal of it cannot form an adequate idea of what it must be in its entirety. It is a war in which nations which are in the forefront of civilization, and which for centuries have professed, and to a large extent practised, Christianity, are killing one another—sometimes by thousands daily—by means of engines and weapons which have for years been scientifically prepared, on an immense scale and with extraordinary ingenuity, in order to accomplish, with the utmost rapidity, the utmost amount of destruction.

Let us recall two predictions, each of them supported by reasonable arguments, which have been utterly falsified by this catastrophe.

Not many years before this conflict overwhelmed us we were told by some who had studied such problems, that the next war, whenever it did come, would be brief. The engines of destruction were now so prodigious and so swift in their effect that one or other of the two combatants would quickly be put out of action, and peace would be restored. Since that forecast was made, the engines of destruction have enormously increased in variety and power; and we know how erroneous the forecast has proved.

The other prediction was made, not by those who have studied warfare, but by some who had wide experience in the occupations of peace. Some experts in finance declared that the commercial relations between nations were now so numerous, so intricate, and so strong, that anything like a general war would be impossible. The number of persons in each nation who were interested in the financial prosperity of other nations was so large, and the interests at stake were

on such a gigantic scale, that no Government would contemplate war as a practical solution of international difficulties. The populations whose interests would be imperilled would not tolerate this solution. Some of us can remember how the Great Exhibition of 1851 led many people to hope that commerce would put an end to war. This later forecast assured us that it must do so: and here again we know how erroneous the forecast has proved. Commerce has not succeeded where Christianity has failed.

Why has Christianity failed? Why has God allowed the gigantic evils of war to begin and to continue? For the same reason that He allows each one of us to break, as often as we please, every one of His commandments. It is the price which has to be paid for the inestimable gift of freedom. God, so to speak, has limited His own freedom in order that we may be free. He could have made us perfect machines, unable to go wrong and violate His will. That would have made vice impossible; but it would have made virtue equally impossible. There would have been no sin; but there would also be no righteousness. We do not call a good chronometer virtuous or righteous; it cannot help keeping time correctly. The God of love desired to make something nobler than a perfect machine. He willed to have beings who could serve Him of their own free will, and of their own free will return His love. That determination involved the possibility that some of His creatures would refuse to serve Him and would rebel. We believe that this has happened with regard to some of those spiritual beings whom we call angels. We know that it has happened with regard to mankind. We ourselves have taken part in this rebellion. Thus it comes to pass that there is much conflict and crime among individuals, and much conflict and crime among nations—in other words, war.

There is obvious difference between conflict of individuals and conflict of nations. When two individuals claim the same property, a court of law decides between them, and they are forced to abide by the decision. When one individual violently assaults another, the law punishes the assailant, and he is forced to abide by the penalty. But when serious disputes arise between nations, there is no court before which they can be compelled to plead; and if they do consent to plead before a court, that court cannot enforce its

decision. Moreover, there are some questions which no nation that values its liberty can consent to submit to arbitration. The only possible arbitrator in such a case is war. Such is the condition of the human race, and Christianity has to work upon human society as it exists; namely, as a number of independent States, each of which is judge of its own rights. If there could be a universal perfecting of the characters of individual men and women, then war would be made impossible by making all misconduct impossible. But does any reasonable person expect that this universal perfection will be reached in this world?

So far as we can see, the only way in which God could have prevented the possibility of war would be never to have created beings with free will, never to have made anything nobler than a conscious machine. Such a creature would be far indeed from being in the likeness of God.

But there are those who tell us that Christ has forbidden war. He has said, 'Resist not evil,' and He has ordered those who are smitten on the one cheek to offer the other to the smiter. He has said so; but it does not follow from this that He has forbidden war. There is no instance on record of Christ's telling soldiers that, if they wish to enter His Kingdom, they must leave the army. Nowhere in the Bible are soldiers told that theirs is a wicked calling. When men on military service asked the Baptist what they ought to do, he did not tell them that they must cease to be soldiers.

Let us look at some other commands given by Christ. He said, 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth.' He said, 'Give to every one that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.' Do we find that the conscientious objector never lays by any money? that he always gives to every beggar, however undeserving the beggar may be? that he always lends to every borrower, however worthless the security which is offered may be? It is quite certain that the strenuous opponents of warfare do not act in this way. Quite reasonably, they save and invest money, and they are as prudent as other people are about giving and lending. They see that these commands of Christ are not to be taken literally. Then why is 'Resist not evil' to be taken literally? It is obvious that to interpret all these commands as *rules to be kept in the letter* is to make our Lord's teaching a laughing-stock to the common sense of mankind.

We can see two reasons why Christ has expressed Himself in this way. 1. He has put His teaching in this startling form in order to arrest attention and set us thinking. Such precepts are not likely to be forgotten; and they stimulate both thought and feeling in a very high degree. 2. Seeing that they are in the form of *rules* which in a sane society *cannot* be kept, underneath them there must be *principles of conduct* which *can* be observed. In a word, like so much Oriental teaching, they are figurative. They do not tell us what we are actually to do; they indicate *temper*; and temper is nine-tenths of religion. So far as our own personal feelings are concerned, we must not resent injury, but be ready to suffer it again; although for the sake of society, and for our assailant's own sake, we must resist and endeavour to check him. To give to every beggar, and to surrender our goods to every claimant, would do incalculable mischief; but our reason for refusing must not be simply that we desire to keep for our own enjoyment all the property that we possess.

The objector has yet another plea. Christ has said, 'Love your enemies.' Yes, and He has shown us what He means by that. We are to do them good, and we are to pray for them. In another place He intimates that, if they repent, we are to forgive them. That is the way in which the God of love deals with us. He is always doing us good; and, when we rebel, if we repent, He forgives us. Those are the express terms. Full forgiveness for full repentance, but no forgiveness without repentance. This shows us what kind of prayers to offer for our enemies. We are to ask God to turn their hearts, to abate their pride and assuage their malice, and to prevent their wicked devices from being accomplished. But there is this difference between God's treatment of us and our treatment of our enemies. He knows better than we do ourselves when we have really repented; and His forgiveness follows at once. But with regard to the repentance of our enemies we need security. We need strong evidence, something approaching to proof. For it is not merely our supreme interests as a nation that are at stake; we are joint-trustees and joint-champions for the rights and liberties of the whole world. We dare not grant forgiveness and peace without taking all possible security that the abominations which our enemies have committed shall never be attempted again. There are people who would make

enormous concessions to the enemy in order to be free from the enormous horrors of this war. We must beware of their specious arguments. Millions have shed their life's blood, not merely in order that these horrors should be made to cease, but in order that they may be made impossible for all future time. Are we willing that that blood should be shed in vain? A patched-up peace would be treason to our noble army of martyrs.

Few words are needed to show that our cause in this war is 'the cause of righteousness and honour.' Even if there had been no treaty binding both Germany and ourselves to protect Belgium from aggression, the infamy of attacking a small inoffensive kingdom would have justified us in coming forward to defend the innocent sufferer. The fact that we were solemnly pledged to protect Belgium against any assailant, and that the assailant was one of those who had given the same pledge as we had given, rendered it impossible for us to withhold protection, without being guilty of infamy almost equal to that of Germany. That was how the matter stood four years ago. How does it stand now? The unspeakable atrocities and abominations committed by the enemy in Flanders, France, Serbia, Rumania, Russia, Poland, Armenia, Mesopotamia, and on the high seas, have made war not only a sacred duty which we must not ignore, but an imperative necessity which we dare not ignore, if we value either our own credit as moral beings or the liberties and lives of the whole human race.

'There was war in heaven.' One is sometimes asked whether the Book of Revelation does not contain predictions of our conflict, and whether the Kaiser, with his cruel armies and wicked devices and lying statements, is not adumbrated there. The answer to that question is simple and decisive. 1. The author of that book wrote, probably about A.D. 96, but possibly some twenty-five years earlier, to give encouragement and warning to the Christians of that day. What use would it have been to them to have obscure allusions to the German Emperor and his allies? 2. Like all Christians of that age, the writer of the Apocalypse believed that the world would almost immediately come to an end through the Return of Christ in glory. Is it likely that a Prophet who believed that the world would hardly see the end of the first century, would have visions as to what would take place in the world in the twentieth century?

No; what the Prophet did see is this. However skilful agents of evil may be in adapting the marvellous powers of nature to their wicked purposes, and however successful they may be in inducing lying prophets to proclaim their aim as a thing to be desired to make one wise, yet, sooner

or later, the mills of God do their appointed work, and the evil-doers are ground to powder. In one respect it is not fanciful to say that this war on earth resembles that which the Seer calls 'war in heaven.' In it the moral forces of the world are uniting to defeat the efforts of the devil.

Literature.

THE NEW TEACHING.

THOSE who have heard of the New Teaching—and who with any interest in education has not?—will now be able to learn what it is. For Dr. John Adams, Professor of Education in the University of London, has edited a volume entitled *The New Teaching* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), to which contributions have been made by teachers of all the familiar subjects, and they are all exponents, in practice as well as in theory, of this new method. Professor Adams himself contributes the first article, and it is of course on the Teaching of English. But he also contributes an Introduction to the whole book, for the purpose of telling us how the new teaching differs from the old. What are its claims?

First, it trains pupils in initiative. Next, the teacher of the new teaching takes account of every pupil's point of view and peculiarities. Thirdly, grammar is banished, direct reading, writing, or speaking taking its place. Other things are mentioned, but they are minor or dependent; those three are the things that give this teaching the title of 'new' (or 'direct,' as some prefer to call it). It is nearly a return to the system of education that was prevalent in Scotland before the passing of the Education Act in the seventies. The parochial schoolmaster sat in his desk; the pupil went up to him with his work and had it examined; he then returned to his seat and went on working out his problems for himself or studying his text-book. But of course experience has taught improvements. The class is not annihilated by the new teaching. The individual pupil comes first, but he is still a member of the class.

What are the dangers? They are summed up in one word—coddling. Dr. Adams denies that the new teaching is guilty of coddling. 'There is really no danger. The "royal road" is as unattain-

able to-day as it was when the hoary proverb was in its first youth. There will always be plenty of difficulties to brace up our pupils. Surely there is no need to supply artificial obstacles after the manner of those who arrange steeplechases and golf courses, or even deliberately to retain difficulties that at present exist. The maintenance of our absurd weights and measures has been over and over again supported, apparently in all seriousness, on the ground of the excellent training involved in struggles with such troublesome items as $5\frac{1}{2}$ and $30\frac{1}{4}$. When all artificial difficulties have been removed, there will always remain an irreducible surd of troublesome elements that will give full exercise to all the energy and determination available among our pupils. When the young people have been taught to study, and thus to avoid waste of effort, there will always remain the great mass of legitimate difficulties that no man can remove. If bunkers and hazards did not exist in our school course we might have to follow Voltaire's suggestion about God, and invent them; but of difficulties in learning there will never be a lack.'

In the chapter on the teaching of History, Mr. E. L. Hasluck discusses the difficulty arising from different views of any event or movement—a conservative view and a liberal. He comes to the conclusion that one case of over-emphasis on the 'Tory' side will balance another case on the 'Radical' side. And in actual fact 'there have been no complaints.' Why not so also in the teaching of religion? How well the old parochial teachers taught the Bible. No doubt each teacher had his own point of view, but 'there were no complaints.'

Professor Percy Nunn writes well on the teaching of science. Thus: 'The most obvious and fundamental characteristics of the scientific life are a love for "nature" and a disinterested desire to under-

stand her ways. There are two things here, love and understanding, which God has joined together and man cannot hope to sunder without grievous loss to both. Wordsworth spoke sound philosophy when he said that "Nature never did betray the heart that loved her." The complementary proposition is equally true: it is only to her lovers that Nature reveals her secrets. She has endless ruses for baffling the inquiries of those who do not approach her in the right spirit. That is why the magician and the medicine-man have contributed so little to scientific knowledge. They have sought to understand Nature not because they loved her but because they feared her, or they have tried to bully her into subservience to their own ends. That is, again, why practical applications of science—even the more clearly beneficent ones, such as the use of anæsthetics, antiseptics, X-rays, and wireless telegraphy—have generally been based on the discoveries of men who pursued nature-knowledge for its own sake. It is the plain hard fact that valuable scientific truths are not attainable by the man who seeks them simply for the sake of subsequent dividends. He can gain them only if he is able for a while to put the marriage-portion out of his head and woo Nature as a disinterested lover. Commonly he cannot, and so prudently employs, at an exiguous remuneration, some one who can. The first aim of the science-teacher must be, then, to make his pupils disinterested lovers of nature.'

FAITH AND FREEDOM.

The Rev. Charles H. S. Matthews, who edited *Faith or Fear?* has now edited a similar volume and called it *Faith and Freedom* (Macmillan; 6s. net). The new volume is, however, more openly a Broad Church manifesto, or, as the editor and his contributors would prefer to say, a declaration on behalf of Liberal Christianity. His contributors are Alfred Fawkes, W. Scott Palmer, Charles E. Raven, A. Clutton-Brock, Harold Anson, and Winifred Mercier.

The most liberal is Mr. Fawkes. His essay on 'The Development of Christian Institutions and Beliefs' makes a pretty sweep of New Testament beliefs, and as a consequence of Reformation theology. But Mr. Clutton-Brock, if less sweeping, is not less disconcerting. His occasional observations, dropped by the side of his main argument as

if they were mere truisms, are enough to turn an ecclesiastical world upside down. 'Will no Church, will not the Church of England, ever dare to affirm that it is a Church just because it has no status, no laws, no morality, no power of judgment, but only a common desire to know and to love God?' 'A Church should confess itself unfit to make any conditions whatever of membership. It should offer to all men the hospitality of God Himself, confessing that it lacks His omniscience. For what is it but the fellowship of those who desire the knowledge of God and who are all aware of their ignorance of Him?' Those are two of them. Is he wrong? Or is the Church wrong?

The book will not die of dullness. That at least is evident. More than that, it is instructive, highly instructive. The demand of the day is for reconstruction. But what is reconstruction? We have been rather pleased with the word. It seemed to be a new form of reinterpretation—and no more than that. Is this reinterpretation? To reinterpret you must retain the things that you are to reinterpret. The test case is the Person of Christ. How do these liberal Christians interpret the passage, 'Who being in the form of God,' etc.? After reinterpretation how much is left of historical fact?

THE MODERN MINISTER.

The Lyman Beecher Lectureship on Preaching in Yale University has produced its forty-fourth volume. The author is Professor Henry Sloane Coffin, and the title *In a Day of Social Rebuilding* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net).

If it were not that the lectures have to be published, each of the Yale lecturers on Preaching might ignore his predecessors and say what Preaching means to him. Professor Coffin comes near that ideal. Only once does he refer in this respect to those who have gone before, saying that they have made it unnecessary for him to enter into the details of delivery. He *has* said what Preaching means to him. It means Adaptation, Reconciliation, Evangelism, Worship, Teaching, Organization, and Friendship—Friendship meaning Pastoral Work. Then when he has said his say—clearly, honestly, impressively—on these topics, he gives the last lecture to the description of an ideal minister for the present time. It is a time, you observe, of social rebuilding. The social aspect is

emphasized throughout. 'What, then, are some of the outstanding characteristics to be sought in those who would lead the Church's ministry in this day of social rebuilding?

'First, *vision*. We must be dreamers of dreams.

They, in the ages lying
In the buried past of the earth,
Built Nineveh with their sighing,
And Babel itself in their mirth;
And o'erthrew them with prophesying
To the old of a new world's worth:
For each age is a dream that is dying,
Or one that is coming to birth.'

'Second, *moral intuition*. Builders of a new world must feel at their fingers' tips when things are right—when nations, when industrial relations, when men in every touch of life on life, are adjusted according to the will of God.'

'Third, *sympathy*. A few years ago the engineers who were charged with the construction of the new Grand Central Terminal in New York City faced the difficult problem of building new tracks on new levels, while they kept the existing traffic in full operation and had the trains arriving and leaving on schedule. In part it was a problem of sympathy—sympathy with the needs of the future, so that adequate facilities for years to come might be supplied; sympathy with the existing plan, so that, although palpably obsolete, they would keep it going with as little interruption as possible. It would have been much easier, of course, could traffic have been suspended while the new station was being prepared. There were many parts of the work which had to be carried on under unusual risks to the workmen and with extraordinary difficulties. All social rebuilding has to be undertaken under similar conditions.'

'Fourth, *daring*. Sympathy with the good in what is may hold us cautiously to it, when we ought to be moving out and up into what should be. When one recalls that leaders of the Christian Church in its earliest period were spoken of with bated breath as "these that have turned the world upside down," one feels like saying of their living successors, as Pope makes Alexander Selkirk say of the beasts on his island: "Their tameness is shocking to me." All great institutions must be conservative: they are custodians of values they dare not put in jeopardy. One would not have the Church less careful in safeguarding its doctrine,

in preserving approved customs in worship, in exercising prudence before it commits itself to innovations in social theory. But to employ love like Christ's, and such love only, as a guiding principle in practical affairs cannot be other than revolutionary.'

'Fifth, the chief characteristic which must be his is *faith*, faith in a God big enough to remake a world, and good enough to make it a Christian world. The last generation in its recovery of the historic Jesus Christianized our thought of God. We bow before no deity less good than Jesus of Nazareth. But in Christianizing His character men have often parted with His cosmic control. A very frank theological teacher once confessed in a moment of confidence: "I haven't the least difficulty with the divinity of Jesus; He is the God I adore. What I want to be assured of is that there is a Divinity like Him in charge of the universe." In humanizing God we have dwarfed Him. The God of many prayers and sermons is a companionable Deity to whom men approach unawed. In much religious intercourse

the air

Nimble and sweetly recommends itself
Unto our gentle senses. The heaven's breath
Smells wooingly here.

This "heavenly Pal" (if one may be pardoned the expression) is so good that He can be counted on to do all He can to help us with a world that has gone to pieces; but one is not convinced that He is competent for so gigantic a task as its complete rebuilding.'

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS.

There are those who say that the most serious of the problems to be solved when the War is over will be economic problems. We do not think so. The religious and moral problems will be more important and more perplexing. But the economic nuts will be hard enough to crack. And it is well that so thoroughly capable an economist as Professor William Robert Scott of Glasgow has come forward already with a statement of their difficulty and with suggestions for their solution. This is the second series of his *Economic Problems of Peace after War* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 6s. net).

One of the problems discussed is a League of

Nations in its commercial aspects. Professor Scott can scarcely be called enthusiastic, but when did you find a professor of Economics enthusiastic? Did not Carlyle call it 'the dismal science'? This is what Dr. Scott says:

'The project of a League of Nations is a scheme which may be, on the whole, deserving of a fair trial. The end of the war is the time when it could be established with the best prospects. In the words of Lord Bryce: "If this opportunity be lost, another such opportunity may never re-appear." No doubt, there are many obstacles and hindrances, political, constitutional, military, and even economic. But if no League of Nations is established, against these must be balanced the almost certain return of tension and insecurity not many years after peace has been signed. The prospect offers sufficient hope to point towards giving the scheme a trial, but not sufficient hope to rely upon it until it has actually justified itself by a protracted test. Thus the most that can be said of the scheme at present is that it is a favourable uncertainty, against which is to be set an unfavourable certainty. In such circumstances we should be wise, upon the whole, in accepting Tennyson's maxim, "Cleave ever to the sunnier side of doubt."'

THE DWELLER IN THE INNERMOST.

Under the title of *The Visions of an Artist* (Kelly; 7s. 6d. net), Mr. H. W. Shrewsbury has published a volume of Studies on the Paintings of G. F. Watts. The paintings have been reproduced—twenty-one of them—in Vandyck photogravure, most successfully and most attractively. They are well worth the price of the book. Mr. Shrewsbury does not describe the pictures as an artist might describe them, but as a preacher. He describes them as a preacher for preachers. He offers them as material for the pulpit, effective, fresh material. Here is a fair example of his manner. The picture is 'The Dweller in the Innermost.' He says:

'In the inward kingdom of the heart, then, there is no compelling force such as there is in the great universe without. But we are not left without guidance. There is a "dweller in the innermost" to point out the best course to take, the right thing to do, and that dweller in the innermost is Conscience.

'Conscience! It is not an easy word to define. Its precise significance will be seen by referring to

its derivation. First, there is the Latin verb *scio*, "to perceive," "to know," and from that the noun *scientia*, "knowledge," then the proposition *con*, "together with." From the union of these comes, *conscientia*, shortened into our English word "conscience." Conscience is, therefore, knowledge that we share together with others, an understanding of those things which are considered right or wrong according to the general perceptions of the community in which we live. And just as the intelligence and moral and spiritual development of the community develops, so will conscience develop also; and when the community has come under the influence of that greatest of teachers, Jesus Christ, conscience attains its highest development. This story will illustrate how conscience can develop. When, in the early part of the nineteenth century, my grandfather was a missionary in South Africa, he had a Kaffir servant called John. John in earlier days had some glimmerings of Christian teaching, but he was an unconverted heathen, with the conscience of the average Kaffir. On one occasion he had been taking part with other natives in a cattle-raiding expedition. They had driven away a herd from a kraal, and if only they could get the herd over the ridge of a hill they would be able to evade pursuit. But they were still some distance from the summit when signs of daybreak appeared. "Kneel down, boys," said John. And as the Kaffirs knelt around him he offered up this prayer: "O God, Thou seest we have got safely away with these cattle. Keep it dark till we get them over the ridge." In later years, when fuller knowledge had come to John and his conscience was more highly developed, he could not have offered such a prayer.'

CATHOLICITY.

In our efforts after reunion most of us stop somewhere. The Anglican would unite with the Roman, the Scottish Churchman with other Presbyterians, the Free Churchman in England with all evangelical Christians. Are there those who would embrace all everywhere who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus? No doubt there are. But that is not the end. When the Rev. R. Heber Newton, D.D., wrote his book and called it *Catholicity* (Putnam; 7s. 6d. net) he had discovered no difference between Christians and Pagans; or if there was a difference, he thought the Pagans had it on

the whole (they were at any rate more ancient—'The Church, spelled with a capital C, was an institution of Chaldea, India, and Egypt, millenniums ago, as it is of Italy and England and America to-day'); and he saw no reason why he should prefer Christ to Muhammad.

He says, 'What is true between the different churches of Christianity is true also between Christianity and other religions. Is man one in nature the world over; the human race, despite all its vast variations, one *genus homo*; the blood coursing in the veins of Asiatics, Europeans, Africans and Americans the same sacred ichor—as by all our scientific research is proving to be the fact? Then is real religion one, wherever, in the differing religions of earth, the soul of man, seeking to adjust itself to its cosmic relationships—to know its cosmic source, to obey its cosmic law, to reach its cosmic goal—looks up to God in hope and trust, looks out to man in love. The religions of men are many; the religion of man is one. Vary as religions may and must under varying environments and heredities, through the varying temperaments of different races and the varying stages of the growth of man; emphasizing, as each must needs do, the peculiar phase of the divine life imaged in each of these differing human mirrors; marked, as each necessarily is, by the errors which are the shadows of these partial truths, yet are all but variations of the one true religion, the life of God in the soul of man.'

Now no one will charge Dr. Newton with dishonesty. It is simply that he did not know. In the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* every religion has been described, always by an expert, and he has been allowed to say the most for his religion that can be said. What is the result? That there is, or has been, in the world no religion worth the name beside Christianity, whatever test you apply—doctrine or life. To be a Christian and know what you are is to make it impossible for you to be a Buddhist, a Muslim, or a Babist.

Take the doctrine of the Trinity. Dr. Newton takes it. He repeats the rather familiar facts about the Hindu and other Triads and is satisfied. But so different are the pagan Triads from the Christian Trinity that writers on the Triads are reluctant to lay their doctrine alongside that of the Christian doctrine, and absolutely refuse to use the name of Trinity.

NATIONAL GUILDS.

It is held by some economists—and they are increasing in numbers—that the day of the private capitalist is done. What then? State management? No, not solely, they say. Their substitute is National Guilds. There has been a considerable literature issued in their interest, and at least one vigorous newspaper, the *New Age*, has identified itself with the movement. The latest book is *The Meaning of National Guilds*, by Maurice B. Reckitt and C. E. Bechhofer (Palmer & Hayward; 7s. 6d. net).

What is the meaning of National Guilds? A National Guild, they answer, 'is a democratically self-governing association which, consisting of all the workers engaged in any main industry, would be responsible for carrying it on in conjunction with the State.

'For example, a National Mining Guild would be composed of every worker of all grades—administrative, technical, skilled and unskilled, on the surface and underground—actively engaged in mining. As a democratic association, its members would be associated on an equal basis, and not in the undemocratic industrial relationship of employers and employees. As a self-governing body, the National Mining Guild would have full powers, without outside interference, over all industrial matters affecting its members, over the administration of all the mines in the country, and over everything that concerned methods and conditions of mining. Ownership of the mines and of the plant and other forms of capital used in mining would be vested in the State, but they would be at the disposal of the Mining Guild to be worked in the public interest.

'Similarly, in the case of, say, a National Transport Guild, the whole national machinery of transport (railways, shipping, vehicles, canals, etc.) would be the property of the community, but the monopoly of its working would be exercised by the Guild.

'In every main industry, then, the workers, organised in a self-governing National Guild, would have the monopoly and control of its working in partnership with the State, which would be the owner of the means of production. The aim of National Guild service is the right conduct of industry in the interests of the community. For this every Guildsman would be responsible to

his Guild, and every Guild to the community through the other Guilds and the State.'

That is clear. The rest of the book is its confirmation. It is written with full force of conviction and is sure to carry conviction to the mind of many a candid reader.

THE Gnostics.

The most important change made in the second edition of Mr. Thomas Whittaker's book *The Neo-Platonists* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 12s. net) is in the appendix on the Gnostics. It is true, there is a new supplement on the Commentaries of Proclus which is of very great value. But the Gnostics make the difference between the two editions, and make it necessary that every student of Neo-Platonism should secure the second edition.

The point is that Mr. Whittaker no longer believes that Gnosticism was a development of Christianity. The researches of Reitzenstein in the ancient mystery-religions have made it clear that the gnosis owed its origin to Egyptian priests or prophets who wrote in Greek but had the command of a genuine basis of native theology.

But if Gnosticism derived little from, it gave much to, Christianity. 'For the Gnosis was not primarily disinterested search for truth, scientific or philosophical. The phrase was, in full, "knowledge of God," and this knowledge had such objects as material prosperity or protection from "demons." A safe passage into the invisible world, it was thought, could be secured by means of sacred formulæ like those of the old Egyptian religion. Rebirth was supposed to be conferred by rites of baptism (called in the Epistle to Titus, iii. 5, the laver of regeneration). The astrological fatalism that had come from Babylonia was felt as an actual oppression, and deliverance from it was sought through the aid of a higher power than the planetary spirits (the world-powers of the Pauline demonology). Here the readiest illustrations occur in the New Testament: but it was the recipient, not the source, of the Gnostic ideas; which were not distinctively either Jewish or Christian, but belonged to a wider movement in which the Judæo-Christian tradition was only one current.'

Such is Reitzenstein's conclusion; Mr. Whittaker accepts it.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

It is much to be interested in an author before we read his book. Have you heard of Philip Anthony Brown, B.A., of New College, Oxford? If not, read Professor Gilbert Murray's introduction to his book on *The French Revolution in English History* (Crosby Lockwood; 7s. 6d. net), and you will know him and love him. Professor Murray has that gift, when he finds the right subject.

Obtaining First Class Honours in History in 1909, Brown stayed on in Oxford for a term or two, acting as Professor Murray's private secretary. 'In 1911 he went to Newcastle as a tutor in the classes held under the joint management of the University and the "W.E.A."; this led in 1912 to his appointment as Lecturer in Economics in Durham University, which he combined afterwards with a similar post in the London School of Economics.'

'When the war came, he seemed again to have no hesitation what to do. With a little group of college friends he enlisted as a private in the Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry. He did not wish to be an officer. He had no military training and he liked to be with working men, sharing their lot. As a matter of fact, officers were much needed at the time, and eventually he was persuaded to take a commission in the 13th Battalion of the Durham Light Infantry, a happy choice, where he found that some of the men in his company already knew him as a "W.E.A." lecturer.

'He showed in the army the same power of leading men which he had possessed in his teaching life, and the same power of attracting love. His letters will, I understand, be published, together with the full memoir. For the present it will be enough to record briefly the manner of his death.

'It was on the night of 4th November 1915, in a thick fog, that he was out on patrol with his servant and friend, Private Thomas Kenny, when some Germans, who were lying out in a ditch in front of their parapet, opened fire, and he fell shot through both thighs. Kenny took him on his back, and through heavy and repeated fire crawled about for more than an hour, trying to find his way in the fog back to our trenches. Brown repeatedly urged Kenny to leave him, but Kenny would not. At last, when the wounded man had

lost consciousness and Kenny himself was almost exhausted, he came to a ditch which he recognized. Here he left Brown, and went on to look for help. Eventually he found some men at a listening post, and guided them back to where Brown lay, though the enemy "opened heavy fire with rifles and machine guns and threw bombs at thirty yards' distance." When Brown was at last brought in he recovered consciousness for a short time. We hear that he smiled and said, "Well, Kenny, you're a hero," and soon afterwards died. Kenny was awarded the Victoria Cross.

There is a portrait of Philip Brown in the book, a portrait of a very youthful beautiful (is the word admitted?) English lad. You do not need even Professor Murray's tribute for interest in him.

But the book? It is the impression made by the Revolution on this country. So Wordsworth is here, and Coleridge, and Campbell, and Landor, and Byron, and Godwin, and Shelley—they are all here; and more than they, the societies are here which agreed and which disagreed; and we see with great clearness and some surprise that in the shaping of the England we live in the French Revolution had a most momentous part. The deepest impression made by the book is the ease with which this young man handled his obscure and almost intractable matter.

The Rev. A. T. Fryer of 62 Newbridge Road, Bath, has published *A Catechism for those Preparing for Confirmation*. There are 40 sets of questions, and each set contains from 8 to 13 questions. Each set is printed on a separate slip. Clergymen should write to Mr. Fryer.

The *114th Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society* has been issued (Bible House; rs.). This is the first sentence: 'Amid the raging of the nations there has been no pause in the work of translating the oracles of God. During this last twelvemonth the Society has added to its long list versions in SEVEN FRESH LANGUAGES.' Are you curious to know these languages? They are Yergum for a tribe in N. Nigeria; Zande for tribesmen in the heart of Central Africa; the Altai dialect of Kirghiz Turkish; the Angami dialect of Naga in the hill-country between Assam and Burma; Mikir for another tribe in N. Assam; the Ecuadorean and the Bolivian Quichua, dialects of

Quichua spoken in Ecuador and Bolivia respectively. Besides these versions there have been many revisions. It is altogether an amazing record for a year of war.

An American author whose book is noticed this month makes no difference between Christianity and other religions. Another American author, Mr. George Cross, answering his own question, *What is Christianity?* (Cambridge University Press; \$1 net), simply passes all other religions by and enters into the contents of Christianity itself. If you do not know what Christianity is from a knowledge of Christ, you will never know it from a knowledge of religion.

What are its contents? They are Apocalypticism, Catholicism, Mysticism, Protestantism, Rationalism, Evangelicism. And then, what *is* Christianity? First it is a quality of Spiritual Life; next, it is a distinctive type of religion; thirdly, it is a religion whose whole character is determined by the personality of Jesus Christ; fourthly, it is the practice of the most perfect human fellowship; fifthly, it is the religion which is one and the same with true morality; sixthly, it is the religion of moral redemption; and lastly, it is the religion of perfect peace.

Those who are earnest about Reconstruction should see a volume just issued from the Cambridge University Press. It contains *Selected Papers on Social and Economic Questions*, by Sir Benjamin Chapman Browne. Most of the papers were written before the War began, but almost all of them have a bearing on the condition of things which will be before us when it is over. Take the paper on 'The New Army from an Employer's Point of View.' It was written ten years ago. But you will find in it—'After the late war, there was a great deal of disappointment at the difficulty which many officers and men found in returning to civil life, and I fear that many of them never recovered the positions that they then gave up in order to serve their country. This ought not to be, and I think it has caused a feeling that whatever the Government may talk about or promise, when a war is over it does not really much care whether the men get comfortably settled again or not. I believe that in the conviction that the Government really cares, lies the secret of the whole thing.'

Then you will read: 'What the Government ought to aim at is to bring about such a state of things that certain employers would absolutely prefer old soldiers to mere civilians. If this was the case with the employer of one man in twenty, it would probably be sufficient to absorb all the old soldiers about whom we are writing, and it must always be borne in mind that all the workman wants is for some *one* employer to be really anxious to obtain his services. One very simple way to effect this would be to do as is done with horses, and allow the employer what might be called a registration fee of say 1s. a week to be able to produce the man whenever he was wanted and to keep him employed in the meantime. A small employer in many cases probably does not make more than 1s. a week clear profit upon every man he employs, and to double this would be a very strong inducement, and having once got hold of a soldier he would do the best he could, in his own interest, to teach him and make him as useful as possible.'

Other papers deal with Alms-giving, Commencing Business, Unemployment, Christian Politics, Gambling, Strikes, the Return to Work, and the like. And always there is the keen eye, the kindly heart, the settled will to give every word its utmost influence.

When there is anything doing Mr. H. G. Wells is always there. At the moment it is the League of Nations that is uppermost. And Mr. Wells has his say on it. He calls the book, non-committally, *In the Fourth Year* (Chatto & Windus; 3s. 6d. net). For, to tell the truth, he has not made up his mind yet. At least he had not when he began to write the book, and the writing of the book has not helped him. It is too difficult a matter for that; it has too many ends and edges. He is not clear even about that blessed word democracy. In this very book he begins to wonder if he really wants to send King George the Fifth into private life. He is in a painful state of suspense. 'These are things in the scales of fate. I will not pretend to be able to guess even which way the scales will swing.' So it is a book of discussions—most delightful, most futile.

There is scarcely any subject in the Bible so difficult of apprehension as the meaning of the words for 'spirit' and 'soul' and 'flesh.' There

are scholars who still say that St. Paul identified the flesh with the body and so made sin inseparable from our physical nature. There are others who assert that spirit has always a material meaning even in the New Testament, no writer of that age being able to dissociate it from the wind. Professor Ernest de Witt Burton has made once more a thorough study of the use of the three Greek words, in Greek writings and translated works, from the earliest period to 180 A.D., and also of their equivalents in Hebrew. The volume is published under the title of *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh* (at the University of Chicago Press). It is a handsome volume of more than two hundred pages. It may be said without hesitation to contain the last word that can at present be spoken on the subject. We quote the last of the conclusions Professor Burton comes to.

'Neither the evidence of contemporary usage nor that of the New Testament itself warrants us in finding in Paul or in the Johannine writings the notion that the flesh is by reason of its materiality a force that makes compellingly for evil, or that a corporeal being is by virtue of that fact a sinful being. It may perhaps be found in 2 Peter, but probably not even there.'

The Rev. J. H. Briggs, late Missionary in German East Africa, tells us how the C.M.S. Missionaries fared there when the War broke out. They were soon interned, and internment was little joy. But—'An Englishman's faculty for seeing the humorous side of things is a great asset in a German internment camp, and it often keeps him from being down in the dumps. Things are really only annoying when we allow them to vex us, and they are often seen to have an amusing side if we try to find it. It is extremely funny to be told when to get up in the morning, to be made to sit for so many hours of the day cutting out little bits of wood into something called boot-pegs which can never be of the slightest use, to be obliged to play games for two hours every afternoon lest any should suffer from lack of exercise, and to be put to bed as soon as the sun goes down. There was also something quite humorous in the German habit of posting on a notice-board long laudatory accounts of victories, often purely imaginary, and expecting intelligent Englishmen to believe such preposterous nonsense. At the same time the utter absence of reliable news

and of letters from home was a little hard to bear.'

There is much information in the little book about the German 'colony.' Its title is *In the East Africa War Zone* (C.M.S.; 1s. 3d. net).

If *The Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net) gives a fair presentation of present-day preaching there is more power, mental and spiritual, in the pulpit now than there was before the War. Fewer texts are taken for the purpose of homiletical fancy work; more sense is felt of the hour of worship as an irreclaimable opportunity. The proportion of Sermons in this volume dealing with the War is very great. Again and again in the titles one finds words like Sacrifice, Hope, Cost, Discipline, Forward. In all these sermons the War is an instrument, not an end; it is not looked upon as a fact in history, it is looked into as a factor in the life of the spirit. Again and again the preacher assures us that it has become a revelation both of God and of man, a revelation of the mercy of God, of the majesty of man. It is one of the most promising books which the War has produced. This is the 93rd volume of *The Christian World Pulpit*.

Before the War began Miss Mildred Aldrich, an American author, had a house near the Marne. The War came very close to her. She told the story of the day's doings in letters to a friend at home. These letters have been published, first in a volume confined to the retreat from Mons, and now in another volume entitled *On the Edge of the War Zone* (Constable; 5s. net), covering the rest of the War until America came in. None of all the books we have read on the War has given us a clearer understanding of it than this collection of quiet letters. Miss Aldrich visited the battlefield near her home immediately after the battle was fought. Again, she visited it three months later. She says: 'I brought back one fixed impression—how quickly Time had laid its healing hand on this one battlefield. I don't know what will be the effect out there where the terrible trench war is going on. But here, where the fighting turned, never to return—at least we believe it never will—it has left no ugly traces. The fields are cleaned, the roads are repaired. Rain has fallen on ruins and washed off all the marks of smoke. Even on the road to Varedes the thrifty

French have already carried away and fagotted the wrecked trees, and already the huge, broken trunks are being uprooted, cut into proper lengths, and piled neatly by the roadside to be seasoned before being carted away. There was nothing raw about the scene anywhere. The villages were sad, because so silent and empty.'

She was able to appreciate the deeds that were done. 'But, of course, nothing so far has been comparable to the British stand at Ypres. The little that leaks slowly out regarding that simply makes one's heart ache with the pain of it, only to rebound with the glory. Human nature is a wonderful thing, and the locking of the gate to Calais, by the English, will, I imagine, be to the end of time, one of the epics, not of this war alone, but of all war. Talk about the "thin red line." The English stood, we are told, like a ribbon to stop the German hordes,—and stopped them.'

Dr. Sophie Bryant is a great teacher, and a great teacher of the Bible. Her new book *How to Read the Bible in the Twentieth Century* (Dent; 3s. 6d. net) would have been a success at any time; coming now it is sure of a very wide reception. And the wider it circulates the greater the good it will do. For it is courageous as well as convincing. Not only is the Bible history contained in it, but also the method of teaching the Bible, its history, its morality, even its theology. We wonder as we read this interesting and educating book where all the trouble about religious education comes from.

Mr. Harold Begbie knows what his contribution to Reconstruction is to be. It is to be an urgent and persistent effort to improve Education. He does not use the word in the familiar sense. To him Education is not imparting information, nor is it drawing out and developing character, though that is nearer; it is emancipation; it is freeing the human spirit from its bad habits and letting it enjoy the liberty of the sons of God.

How does he go to work? In his own way—by telling stories. In *Living Water* (Headley; 2s. 6d. net) he tells twelve stories. Every story is the record of an actual experience. But of course the experience is worked up and made a story.

The Red Cap on the Cross (Headley; 2s. 6d.

net) is a daring title. And on the cover of the book we see the Cross and the red cap of revolution on it. Is the book the work of a believer in revolution? Yes, truly. For the author, the Rev. Richard Roberts believes in Conversion, and to him Conversion is a revolution in a man's soul. It is a revolution in a man's whole life, and most manifestly of all in his relation to his fellow-men. This is the idea, that no outward form of Reconstruction after the War will serve, only the Reconstruction which takes place within a man, reconstructing his whole attitude to God and equally his whole attitude to his neighbour. The book is thoroughly modern. Its language is modern, its atmosphere is modern. But, as Mr. George Lansbury, who writes a heroic Foreword, says, its text is an ancient word, 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.'

Mr. J. Gardner Hitt has published *The Layman's Book on the General Assembly of 1918* (2s. 6d. net).

The recent death of Dr. Karl Peters has turned men's minds more searchingly towards the German methods of managing colonies. The ugly side is seen in *The Prussian Lash in Africa* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). We say the ugly side, for it is so horribly ugly that we cannot believe it is the only side. We know about Peters. He is gone to his account. But were they all like Peters? And the future? This is the anonymous author's mind on that: 'If the Allies are forced by the fortunes of war to return Germany her colonies, there is no help for it. It is done under necessity. But let there be no pretence in the matter; it is a betrayal of the native, a surrender to barbarism. It is the handing over of millions of weak and helpless people to the most cruel and ferocious form of government.'

'From crude beginnings Hebrew thought soared slowly to lofty heights in the conception of man's relation to God and to his neighbour. First Jahveh was a family or tribal, then a national God, whose power was limited to his own land where his care was bestowed upon his own people alone. By the teaching of the prophets his universality was made clear, though to the end he was believed to watch over his chosen people with special providence. The events of history con-

spired to exalt the power of the priest, until the Torah became supreme, and Israel was changed into the 'people of a book.' Then there was no longer room for prophets like those of the golden age of prophecy, and the mass of the people looked forward eagerly to the coming of a Messiah or deliverer, who with combined secular and sacred attributes would reign in glory over the Hebrew nation. The steps of this development are to be found in the Old Testament hewn out by Moses, the prophets, the psalmists, and the lawgivers. The conception of Jahveh was more or less spiritual from the beginning, since he was worshipped by no image. But it broadened and deepened, until the crude anthropomorphic ideas of the earliest ages passed away to appear no more.'

Thus does Mr. Arthur W. Fox, M.A., summarize his conception of *The Ethics and Theology of the Old Testament* as he has described its development in a volume with that title (Lindsey Press; 3s. 6d. net). It is a volume written, he claims, 'without preconceptions or prejudices, but with the same freedom as would be applied to the study of any other ancient book.' It ought to be added that the author does not really deal with the Old Testament as he would deal with 'any other ancient book,' for he loves and reverences it more than any ancient book he has ever read.

In his new book, *The War and the Coming Peace* (Lippincott; 5s. net)—a sequel to *The War and the Bagdad Railway*—Dr. Morris Jastrow discusses the moral issue of the War and the conditions of the coming peace. The War, he says, is no longer a war of conquest or of any other material thing. It is a war of moral ideals and facts. America came in as a 'response to the aroused conscience of mankind to bring about the triumph of the moral issue involved in the war.' And as for the peace to follow, here are some of the foundations on which it has to be established—'the organization of all nations on a democratic form of government as the primary condition; and then tribunals of arbitration, disarmament, and an assembly of nations in the form of a league or parliament.'

The Eucharistic Life (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net) contains the substance of addresses given by two members of the Oxford Mission Brotherhood of

the Epiphany, at the Students' Conference of the Syrian Christian Church, held at Kottayam, May 1st-5th, 1916. First there is a sketch of the Syrian Church of Malabar. And then in eight chapters the meaning of the Eucharist is explained in simple language and with reverent mind, as the central and sacrificial act of worship.

If there is a difference between Romanism and Protestantism it is in the training of the priest. Where is the Protestant who would go to a book entitled *The Priestly Vocation* for, say, instruction in sermon preparation? Yet listen to this: 'First we have to fix on our subject—not always the easiest part of our work. Let us suppose that on reading through the Sunday Gospel some aspect of it or some incident in it appeals to us from a particular point of view, and that point we decide to develop. Possibly something we have read in the past occurs to mind, and we get out a book—or perhaps several books—to suggest to us a few ideas. Then the first stage of our work is done.

'The next process is to think. We have to make the ideas our own, and develop them according to the bent of our own minds. This cannot easily be done as we sit at our desks. Thoughts will not come to order. Developing a subject in one's mind is a gradual process, and takes time. It can well be done as we walk from place to place, or exercise any light employment. It is specially suitable to do it as we go about our pastoral work. The words we use in our visits to members of our flock are the reflection of our mind and will bear close resemblance to our words in the pulpit. If we find plenty to say, and are conscious of the consolation we give by saying it to the poor individually, why should it not be so likewise when we address them from the pulpit?

'In order to complete our preparation, we must then sit at our desk and write out the substance of our thoughts and put them in methodical order. We should also look up the texts of Scripture on which we rely, and frequently the context will suggest further thoughts. All this will vary between man and man, and between day and day. Some will write long notes, others short. On some days thoughts come easily, on others only with difficulty. Some people may find it useful to write a fair copy when the matter has been rearranged, others will arrange their matter

methodically at the outset, and so forth. When we have done this, we can leave the sermon to the time, presumably not far distant, when we are going to preach it.'

The author of the book is the Right Rev. Bernard Ward, F.R.Hist.S., Bishop of Brentwood. The publishers are Messrs. Longmans (5s. net).

This month there is a striking reference in these pages to the value of rhythm for the machinery of life, for the machinery of the moral life (if the word may be used) as well as for the machinery of the bodily life. The subject is dealt with and developed in a book called *Economy of Energy and How to Secure it*, written by Mr. Eustace Miles, M.A. (Sampson Low; 5s. net). It is the book of an enthusiast. So thoroughly has Mr. Miles entered into his subject that he must have said to himself, 'This one thing I do.' He has read other men's books. Is there any book touching his subject that he has not read? Now we must read his own book, and we must read the quotations which he has made from other books. And if we read with open minds and practise what we learn we shall certainly live more happily, certainly more usefully, perhaps even for more days and years.

But about rhythm: 'We all know how Rhythm helps us to economise Energy in walking and marching, in club-swinging, in swimming, and in ever so many other occupations. There is a certain Rhythm of meal times, though we seldom observe it; there is a certain Rhythm of sleep, not that it is the same for all individuals; but for each individual there are numbers of occupations in which he could economise Energy if he studied this matter of Rhythm carefully for himself.

'Think how it saves Energy in pulling, in lifting, in music, and in almost every activity. Think how the heart and the lungs teach us the value of Rhythm. I remember hearing a Greek describing how he built his house to music and singing, the heavy weights being easily lifted to a tune. And in all countries men and women have their Rhythms and music to economise Energy.'

The Gospel of the Cross (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net) is the title of a book written by J. R. Coates, C. H. Dodd, W. F. Halliday, Malcolm Spencer, and Olive Wyon 'to express the message of a Conference of the Swanwick Free Church Fellowship.'

In the middle of it we learn 'the Meaning of Salvation,' and round that word and its meaning all the book turns. It is the preaching of the gospel in modern language and under the influence of modern thought; but it is the old gospel with the old emphasis and power.

In *The Starting Place of Glory*, by the Rev. David M. McIntyre (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net), you will find unhesitating belief in the Second Coming, but no incredibilities of interpretation. More than that, you will find that for one man at least belief in the Second Coming is encouragement to the two great things which make a Saint—luminous likeness to Christ and the faculty of finding other saints.

The story of religious persecution, even within the Church of England and the last half-century, is most curious and instructive. The Rev. Cyril W. Emmet, M.A., B.D., tells it, briefly and temperately, in his book *Conscience, Creeds and Critics* (Macmillan; 3s. net). He tells it so temperately as to introduce a new era in the history of controversy. Never again, we believe, will it be possible for good men to say such bad things of one another as Archdeacon Denison said of the authors of *Essays and Reviews*—that the young were 'tainted and corrupted and thrust almost to hell by the action of this book.'

Mr. Emmet's desire is that men who cannot believe in the Virgin Birth or the physical Resurrection of our Lord should not be held under suspicion of disloyalty to their Church. It is to be observed that it is the miraculous that is still the difficulty. But why are those two miracles singled out? There are raisings from the dead in the Gospels and there are miracles like the walking on the water that are just as incredible to the simply scientific mind as the Virgin Birth. But, however that may be, no one will read this book and feel out of sympathy with anything that is said by its learned and considerate author.

The preacher who is in search of topics for the shorter evening sermon may do worse than look into Mr. W. Y. Fullerton's book, *Life's Dusty Way* (Morgan & Scott; 3s. net). Its chapters are short. They contain expositions of certain facts of life—Habits, Recreation, Restraint, Influence, Friendship, Cheerfulness, Reality, Giving, Silence, Drifting,

and many more. And each topic is illustrated from a large experience of life abroad and at home—to some extent also from fresh literature.

'All mystics,' says Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, 'however diverse their outlook, or inlook, have been curiously gracious and yet more curiously happy men. They have found, if not contentment itself, the way of contentment and an anchorage for the soul. They possess it in patience. They are the pure in heart and blessed because they see, or believe they see, God.'

The word recurs to us as we read the short biography of Benjamin Broomhall and his wife which their son, Marshall Broomhall, M.A., has published under the title of *Heirs Together* (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net). They had other characteristics of the Mystic, these two, and they had grace and happiness. The husband is remembered for his great anti-opium struggle, a struggle which he saw crowned with success just one month before he died. His wife was a sister of Hudson Taylor, the Chinese Missionary.

The secret of their happiness was prayer. It did not depend on its answers. But sometimes the answer came—(or, cautiously with Quiller-Couch, they believed it did). 'Since I wrote (this is Mrs. Broomhall) on my birthday I have had a very gracious answer to prayer. We were being financially tried, although we were economising as best we could. I heard of a friend, already well off, who had received a large fortune from the death of a relative. He is aged, and I asked the Lord to put my husband into his mind to remember him in his will. God's answer was like Himself. The friend wrote a kind letter and sent Father a cheque for double the amount I asked for. We praised God together, and I told Father of my prayer.'

The Rev. J. R. Cohu, M.A., has written a history of *The Evolution of the Christian Ministry* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net), and we do not know any one who could have written it better. He is a reliable scholar, a clear thinker, an experienced author, and above all he is a passionate lover of the truth. His conclusions we shall not repeat. They are in any case the least of it. The method is everything; let every other student work along the right lines and they will reach the right conclusions. The volume belongs to 'The Modern

Churchman's Library,' edited by the Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D.

It is evident to everybody now that one of the first of the economic problems that will fall to be solved when the War is over is how to maintain a satisfactory rate of wages. It may not be possible to keep up the present rate all over. It must be possible to give every man and woman a living wage. What is a living wage? Mr. B. Seebohm Rowntree in *The Human Needs of Labour* (Nelson; 3s. 6d. net) answers: 44s. a week for men and 25s. a week for women. He has not guessed; he has wrought out that result by the most thorough investigation in the city of York. You may take it as right. How is it to be found? He believes that it can be found by *an increase in the productivity of industry*. 'For the war has shown that, when the need arose, huge improvements could be made with incredible rapidity in process after process; and industry could be so organized that, without adding to the strain on the individual worker, the output was enormously increased. If development in this direction continues steadily after the war, and the additional wealth created, or the economies effected, are devoted as far as possible to the payment of a living wage, we shall have taken a long step towards the solution of our problem.'

The Rev. G. Monroe Royce, Rector of St. Thomas's Church, New Windsor, New York, spent a long holiday in England and, under a licence from the Archbishop of Canterbury, acted as locum-tenens wherever he was wanted. He took notes. He has now published *The Note Book of an American Pastor in England* (Putnam; 10s.).

Mr. Royce is outspoken about the condition of things in the Church of England and he is outspoken about himself. In one chapter he tells us 'How I put my Foot in it.' He preached 'to a country village on the sins of gambling, racing, and matrimonial infidelity'; and then discovered that those were the sins which 'the high-bred people' in that village were notoriously addicted to. 'On my way to the station I met a lady, belonging to this little aristocratic community, who passed me with her pretty nose very high in the air. But it served me right and taught me a valuable lesson, for since that great blunder I make it a point to learn something about the special kind of wickedness to

which my various congregations are most addicted, and avoid saying anything on those subjects. This method of preaching may not result in any very great revival of religion, but it avoids giving offence to people of consequence—a matter which all preachers ambitious for popularity would do well to take into prayerful consideration.'

Homeland: A Year of Country Days, by Percy W. D. Izzard (Richmond; 7s. 6d. net). The readers of the *Daily Mail* know the initials P.W.D.I., and they know the short articles on life in the country, an article for every day, which appear over them. These articles are a diary, beginning with March 21, the first day of Spring according to the Calendar, and going right round to March 20. The volume into which this unique diary has been gathered is a very attractive one, attractive even for its printing and paper. Moreover it is illustrated, and the illustrations are a considerable element in the charm.

How is its quality to be conveyed? Take the entry for May 20. It is as good as any other, and any other is as good as it. The title is *Drifting Sweetness*:

'The hawthorn days are here, and hedge-banks which were white already with plumy blossom of the beaked parsley have become doubly white with the lavish bloom of the thorns above. Long leagues of laneside roses in shining masses of creamy white, and in meadows and park lands free-grown, shapely trees white-domed with myriads of flowers, breathing such profuse sweetness that all other scents of May are drowned.

'Excepting the perfume of new-mown hay, no country scent travels farther than that of hawthorn. It floats about the songful land in delicious wafts; it is borne in every little puff of a cool breeze that stirs the hot air; it enwraps and enters every dwelling. At the farmhouse hawthorn rules over the fragrance of the dairy; in the church it overwhelms the odour of old oak. The wind is its carrier far from home, to take its tender suggestion of Maytime beauty to the very heart of towns.

'And the nights—what mystic beauty these softly luminous nightingale nights gain from the drifting sweetness of the still, white thorns!'

Only a month or two ago a writer in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES spoke for an abbreviated Bible and told us what it might do. The idea was of

course not new. Something of the kind has been done by Mackail, and by Frazer of the Golden Bough. Quite recently Messrs. Dent issued *The Shorter Bible*, edited by Arthur Burrell. And now there comes from America an abbreviated Bible under Mr. Burrell's title exactly. At least the New Testament part has come; the Old Testament is to follow. It is edited by Professor Charles Foster Kent, with the collaboration of Professor C. C. Torrey, Mr. H. A. Sherman, Mr. Frederick Harris, and Miss Ethel Cutler (Scribner; \$1 net).

The New Testament is shortened chiefly by omitting doublets in the Gospels. But there are other omissions—Acts 3, the cure of the lame man, the most of Acts 5, including Gamaliel; Acts 9 and 10, the Conversion of Saul (no doubt because told elsewhere) and the Conversion of Cornelius. These are examples. Who will approve? The editors answer that for those who do not approve the complete New Testament is at hand.

But they have also translated the Bible anew, and that 'into simple, dignified, modern English which will present the thought of the biblical writers so plainly and directly that commentaries will be unnecessary.' Take an example. Let it be Eph 2¹¹⁻¹⁸:

'Remember then that once you who were not Jews were separated from Christ, aliens to the commonwealth of Israel, and with no share in the covenants based on divine promises and no hope and no God in the world. But now through union with Christ Jesus you who were once far away have been brought near by the shedding of his life-blood. For he is our peace; he united the two divisions of mankind and broke down the barriers that kept them apart. During his life on earth he set aside the law with its explicit demands, so as to make peace by creating out of these two divisions, through union with himself, a new mankind. Thus in himself through his death on the cross he put an end to that feud by reconciling Jew and alien to God in one body. So he came to proclaim good news of peace to you of alien races who were far away and to the Jews who were near, for it is through him that we both, united by one Spirit, have free access to the Father.'

The Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A., late Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford, and Vicar of East Finchley, has written a short Introduction to the

Apocrypha and other Jewish Writings, 200 B.C. to 100 A.D. The title is *The Uncanonical Jewish Books* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. net). Mr. Ferrar is a scholar. His book is reliable. He is also a writer. His book is readable. This had to be done by somebody. We are glad it has been done by him.

The Rev. Charles Johnson, M.A., and the Rev. J. P. Whitney, B.D., D.C.L., are the editors of a series of small books entitled 'Helps for Students of History' (S.P.C.K.; 6d. net each). Four have been issued—(1) *Episcopal Registers of England and Wales*, by R. C. Fowler, B.A.; (2) *Municipal Records*, by F. J. C. Hearnshaw, M.A., LL.D.; (3) *Medieval Reckonings of Time*, by Reginald L. Poole, LL.D., Litt.D.; (4) *The Public Record Office*, by C. Johnson, M.A.

The fourth number of the S.P.C.K. Texts for Students is *Libri Sancti Patricii*, the Latin writings of St. Patrick, a revised text, with a selection of various readings, based on all the known manuscripts, edited by Newport J. D. White, D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's and Archbishop King's Professor in the University of Dublin (6d. net).

To their series of 'Translations of Early Documents,' Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley and Canon G. H. Box have added Books III. to V. of *The Sibylline Oracles* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). The editor is the Rev. H. N. Bate, M.A., a faultless scholar, who has done his difficult work most praiseworthily. No longer need even the hard-worked preacher be without some knowledge of 'the Sibyl' or without the insight into revelation which that knowledge brings.

What is the meaning of the name? No one knows. Nestle suggested that the Jezebel of Rev 2²⁰ was a local priestess, and that Jezebel (or Isabel) and Sibyl were originally one and the same. Dr. Postgate was less venturesome. He traced it to a root *sib*, seen in *sapiens*, 'wise,' with the diminutive *ulla*; so that the Sibyl would be 'the wise little woman.'

Mr. Elliot Stock has published five prayers by Archdeacon Wilberforce. The title is *Incense* (1s. net).

In *The Harvest and the Vintage*, by the Rev. C. D. H. McMillan, M.A., Hon. Canon of Bristol

(Scott; rs. 6d. net), we have Apocalyptic in its full flavour. Men are simply revelling in Daniel and the Book of Revelation at present. And they are surely finding food for their souls. Here the Great Pyramid furnishes sustenance or at least sauce. If not the belief itself, it gives confirmation to the belief in the rapture of the saints.

The Missionary Question (Scott; 3s. net) to the mind of the Rev. M. R. Newbolt, M.A., is the question of denominationalism. He surveys Rome in the Mission Field, Protestantism in the Mission Field, Anglicanism in the Mission Field; and he finds perfection in none of them; nor even a close

approach. But Anglicanism comes nearest. Its chief defect is the place given to the Eucharist. So it is the same question as we have at home: 'The Church of England can, and in parts of the Mission Field does, set an example to the world of what Catholic ceremonial may be. She can present the Holy Eucharist as the great corporate action of the faithful. And wherever she does so she finds it an enormous source of strength. When she does not we have cause to fear that she is reproducing just the same formalism, the same lukewarmness, the same shyness of Holy Communion as we are familiar with in rustic parishes at home.'

The Gethsemane of the Fourth Gospel.

BY THE REV. JOHN MONRO GIBSON, M.A., LL.D., LONDON.

THE other three Evangelists had told the story of the Garden of Gethsemane, so St. John does not repeat it, but he tells us of an earlier Gethsemane (12²⁰⁻³³). In the Garden our Lord was already in the abyss; in this earlier Gethsemane He stands at the edge of it and is looking down into its depths. It is the turning-point of the gospel, the crisis of our Lord's career. The great object of the Evangelist, as he tells us, has been to show forth the glory of Christ: first the glory of His life, and then the glory of His death. This is the point of transition from the one to the other.

At first sight the time does not seem to be so very critical; rather do things seem hopeful. He has quite recently had much to cheer Him: the raising of Lazarus, the loving deed of Mary, the Hosannas of the multitudes, and now—in some respects the most hopeful of all—the coming of these Greeks. We do not wonder then that He cries, 'The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified.'

But how? Coronation? Glorious success? World conquest? So it might seem, but there are things to think of that look ominous. The raising of Lazarus was the crowning glory of His ministry, but for that very reason were not the priests plotting for His death? The loving deed of Mary was 'the oil of joy' to His heart, but did it not suggest the anointing of His body for its burial?

These Hosannas of the multitudes, were they not a coronation anthem? It remains to be seen how deep is the enthusiasm, and how long it will last. These Greeks seem to be the first-fruits of the Gentiles; and they are indeed, but how is the harvest to be realized? Will these Jerusalem Hosannas swell into a world welcome? Or must it be, as in the natural harvest, through the burial of the seed? This last seems to our Lord most likely, for He says, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit.' But even if the way does lie through death, has the hour come? The shadow of death has all along been over Him, and since the remarkable experiences at Cæsarea Philippi He has faced it as a dark prospect, but up till now it had not been in full sight; and He is a young man yet. He has spoken of the hour again and again (Jn 2⁴ 7³⁰ 8²⁰), but so far always as 'not yet come.' Can it be that it is coming now?

But what means the appeal of these Greeks? Is there not an alternative suggested here—something to give scope to His still youthful powers before the hour come? Might He not go in person to the Greeks and preach His gospel to them? That this was a recognized alternative we see by turning to 7³⁵, where we read that the Jews said among themselves, 'Whither will this

man go, that we shall not find him? Will he go unto the dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?' An alternative surely well worth considering. The Greek language was the tongue of the civilized world, Greek thought its dominant thought. Though the Roman Empire was the body of the world's civilization, the Greek mind was its soul. We remember how His spirit was stirred when He found a woman of Samaria responding to His appeal, and again when He discovered in a Roman so great faith as He had not seen in Israel. What if there was here good promise of the up-springing of a great Gentile faith! In this connexion we remember the statement by the historian Eusebius, that a deputation was sent from the king of Edessa to invite Him there. It is possible that some such proposal was made by these Greeks; but whether that be so or not, the alternative could not but be in His mind.

What is the will of God? He does not yet certainly know. In the next chapter we find Him sure of it (13¹), but not yet. So instead of rejoicing at the coming of these Greeks, as we should have expected, He is in sore perplexity, in a strait betwixt two. 'Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say?' On the one hand, how strong the Greek appeal;—remember how, when the woman of Samaria came to Him, He saw new fields in Samaria white unto the harvest;—does not the coming of these Greeks mean the field of the world opening now? On the other hand, was not His personal ministry to be restricted to the lost sheep of the house of Israel? Moreover, His mind has evidently been dwelling on the idea of service (12²⁶), and what the servant of the Lord is specially called to do in order to fulfil His ministry—to be despised and rejected of men, to be led as a lamb to the slaughter, to be cut off out of the land of the living, to be stricken for the transgression of His own people, to make His grave with the wicked, and in that way to see the pleasure of the Lord prosper in His hand—was not that the path plainly set forth in the sure word of prophecy? 'What shall I say?' he exclaims. Can it be 'Father, save me from this hour?' Nay: 'For this cause came I to this hour.' So, however attractive the other course is, the will of God is clearly pointing down into the dark abyss: 'For this cause came I to this hour.'

This is the definite decision, accepting the Cross,

not as a grim necessity, but as that which will glorify the name 'Father,' because it will show the Father's love to all the world as nothing else could do. When therefore, instead of praying, 'Save me from this hour,' He pours out His soul in the great petition, 'Father, glorify thy name,' the choice is made, the hour so long dreaded is recognized as having come, and is given a welcome because it is the Father's will for the fulfilling of His ministry. And just as in the later Gethsemane there came an angel from heaven strengthening Him, so now there comes a voice from heaven encouraging Him: 'I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.' It has been glorified in the ministry of life, it will be glorified again in the ministry of death.

Notice here, as we pass, the different degrees of sensitiveness to the divine voice. Jesus hears it quite distinctly; to the multitude it is only a noise as of thunder; while some, more sensitive than the rest, recognize it as an angel voice, though they cannot make out what it says. Still, even for them it was good. They would remember it afterwards when all seemed utterly dark, and would learn to look for some divine meaning in the tragedy of the Cross.

What He says next is of profound importance: 'Now is the judgment (literally "crisis") of this world.' So far we have seen the crisis in the life of Christ, but it is not only a personal but a world crisis. For the world's salvation depended on His resisting all temptation to turn aside from the Cross. This had been the great temptation of His life—not only in the desert, and again when, in answer to the touching appeal of His loved disciple, He had sternly to say, 'Get thee behind me, Satan'; but again and again throughout His ministry. There were pauses in the conflict, as when we are told, 'The devil departed from him for a season'; but these pauses were only to prepare for renewed offensives, the impact of which on His spirit may be recognized in the frequent references in this Gospel to the coming hour, and in the other Gospels to the increased emotion with which 'He stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.' But now that the hour has come and He has finally accepted the Cross in spite of all suggestions, however plausible, to turn from it or even to postpone it beyond the appointed hour, He sees the tempter finally defeated: 'Now is the prince of this world cast out.' And this means

the world redeemed; for the Cross willingly accepted, not as an inexorable fate, but as the crowning glory of the name 'Father,' will be the salvation not of lost sheep of the house of Israel only, but of Greeks and Romans and barbarians and all: 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.' Though He cannot go to Gentiles and preach to them, He can go to Jerusalem and die for them. The Evangelist's note here is worthy of attention: 'This he said signifying by what manner of death he should die.' 'Lifted up from the earth,' He said. Does that mean only lifted up a few feet from the earth, as in crucifixion? Nay: it is not a common word He uses, but a great one meaning exaltation, implying enthronement. It is not the shame of the Cross which is suggested, but its surpassing glory, recognized here in advance by the Sufferer Himself, by Him alone in all the world, for even His beloved disciple John had not a glimpse of it as yet; it was only after the Resurrection and the advent of the Spirit that any of His followers could glory in the Cross.

Looking over the whole passage, what is the keynote of this Gethsemane of the Fourth Gospel? Is it a minor strain? It has indeed a minor undertone, but that is not the dominant note. It is the antiphonal response of the Cross to the Angels' Song of the Advent. 'Glory to God in the highest' is the dominant note, for not only is glory to God the main thought, but that phrase 'in the highest' finds an echo in the word 'lifted up,' which is a variation of that used in the Angels' Song. And the whole meaning of the Cross as here presented is 'Peace on earth and goodwill to men.' So this Gethsemane strain proves to be no Miserere, but rather a Hallelujah, preparing the way for the hymn (Mt 26³⁰), probably the Great Hallel sung as our Lord advanced to the later Gethsemane. There is the dark abyss with a cross in the centre right in front of Him; but, as He looks, the cross becomes a throne, the shame glory, the ultimate outcome the world's salvation.

What a triumphant faith! and He asks us all to share it. It is after this victory that He says to His disciples: 'In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.' And the beloved disciple tells us, 'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.' 'O Jesus, King most wonderful,' author

and perfecter of our faith, may we overcome our world as we follow Thee.

The hour of the Lord came then. Has the day of the Lord come now? That was the crisis of the world in the life of the King. Is this the crisis of the world in the history of the Kingdom? It certainly is the greatest crisis the world has seen since the Crucifixion. Is not the whole world now on the edge of an abyss? That is where we are. 'Where I am, there shall also my servant be,' He said. Let us learn of Him how to face it. Now are our souls troubled, and what shall we say?

Shall it be only, Save us from this hour? There is nothing wrong in that prayer indeed, or it would not have come into our Saviour's mind; but if we do offer such a prayer, it must be subordinate in our case as in His to that other: 'Father, glorify thy name.' How well our Lord remembered His own instructions, giving this petition the first place: 'After this manner pray ye, Our Father, which art in heaven, *Hallowed be thy name.*' Let us, following His example, make this our constant prayer, 'Father, glorify thy name.'

'Father.' God is not an indifferent spectator of the world's agony now any more than He was indifferent to the agony of His Son then. In all our afflictions He is afflicted. God so loved the world as to give His Son to die for it. God so loves the world that even as He bore the agony of permitting the suffering of His Son in order to save it, He is now sharing the agony of this long and cruel war so as to open the way for its salvation from selfishness and sin and all the evils that follow in their train. Yes, even from this abyss let us look up in faith to our Father in heaven.

'Father, glorify thy name.' What a comfort to have a prayer that will suit all circumstances however bright and hopeful, however dark and discouraging. When we have any difficulty as to what we should pray for, we can always fall back on this one—'Father, glorify thy name.' Not Britain's, not France's, not America's, but *THY* name. Glorify it in the two great ways which were in our Lord's mind: the prince of this world cast out; the nations of the world brought in. The prince of this world cast out not only of enemy countries, where he seems to hold almost undisputed sway, but out of our own country and those

of our Allies—which, let us remember, was not possible in a short contest and by an easy victory. At whatever cost, may the prince of this world be cast out.

And the world's salvation achieved: which can only be through the lifting up of Christ crucified

so as to draw all men unto Him, and bring in all over the world the Kingdom of righteousness and peace and holy joy, when every knee shall bow to the King of Love, every heart be loyal to the Prince of Peace, and every tongue confess that He is Lord, to the glory of the Father.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

NOVEMBER.

Jewels in the Mud.

'Can the rush grow without mire?'—Job 8¹¹.

I. A GREAT artist and writer was one day walking in the outskirts of a manufacturing town. It had been dirty, rainy weather, and it occurred to him to take an ounce or two of the black slime from the footpath, and have it analysed. This mud or slime was found to consist of sand, clay, soot, and water. Pondering over the matter, he remembered that it is from such common things that precious stones are formed. It would make a long story to tell the process. You know, of course, that with the help of fire, clay can be made into the finest porcelain. But better still, if the clay is purified and left to itself for a very long time it may form into that lovely blue precious stone called the Sapphire. Then—can you believe it? from the sand we get the opal. Most of you must have seen one, perhaps in a ring of mother's which she values very much, and you wondered how such lovely colours came to be reflected in it.

One day you may read the artist's books—I hope you will—and find out how the opal is formed. From the soot we get the diamond. And last of all the water purified is the same which as a dewdrop sparkled in the heart of a rose. So in wading through mud that morning Ruskin—he was the artist I spoke of—was really 'splashing amongst jewels.'

The mud preaches a sermon to us. It tells us not only that things may be much better than they seem, but that even in the poorest beggar there may be the soul of a great man. Not so very long ago a very poor looking man used to sell news-

papers and matches at a London street corner. Little did the passers-by think that they were paying their pennies to one of the greatest of our poets.

2. But the mud that boys and girls know best is a very commonplace sort of thing, especially when it comes to be the month of November. They never think of jewels in connexion with it. Indeed, they often say that they just hate it. I have known people; however, who thought mud was something to be thankful for. 'Tak' me in among the dubs, they're soft and kindly; the hard road hurts me,' an old Scotswoman said to her daughter who was wheeling her in a bath-chair. Then there are cottages in the country, some of them very warm and happy homes, that are nearly altogether built of mud. At one of her mission stations in Africa, Mary Slessor not only had mud mission buildings, but her own little dwelling-house was an erection of wattle and mud. Much of her furniture too was made from mud; she had a mud sofa where she rested, and a mud seat near the fireplace where the person who cooked for her could sit. And who does not know the wonderful little one-roomed houses that we should never see but for the mud? Where would the swallow be without the where-withal to build her nest?

3. But mud can be something else than kindly. You have heard how the mud of Flanders has made our soldier lads suffer. If Ruskin were alive and had walked through a trench I doubt if he would have thought of it as 'jingling with jewels,' for he hated ugly things. But I read these two lines somewhere just the other day:

Two women looked through their prison bars;
The one saw mud, the other saw stars.

And it may have been left to the 'Tommies' to find jewels amongst the terrible mud of the trenches.

What sort of jewels come 'within their reach do you think? Not the sapphire, or the opal, or the diamond, but the jewels which are, in the sight of God, of great price. Patience and courage; you can understand how wonderful specimens of these have been found in Flanders. Love is there too, in a rough uncut condition perhaps, but it is the genuine article nevertheless.

There are many kinds of sorrow
In this world of love and hate,
But there is no sterner sorrow,
Than a soldier for his mate.

Why have our lads gone to fight? Because they love their country. There are fathers there too who are fighting that the world may be a better place for you boys and girls.

'John Delaney of the Rifles'—who was he?

A name seen on a list,
All unknown and all unmissed.
What to us that he is dead? . . .
Yet he died for you and me.

You sing hymns that speak of crowns. They are not, of course, gold crowns like the one our King wears, nor are the jewels in them like those you see in the jewellers' windows. God will see the rough uncut jewels that He values in the crowns of many soldiers. You surely would not like to face them without having even a single jewel in yours!

'Can the rush grow without mire?' The text is from the Book of Job, the eighth chapter, and the eleventh verse. Job was a man who had a very hard time. Not only did he have everything taken from him, but he was smitten with a loathsome disease. It was so loathsome that people avoided him: even his wife said, 'Give up God, and die.' At last he went and sat down on an ash heap all by himself. He felt very lonely and miserable. Then friends came. They are spoken of as Job's 'comforters,' but poor comfort they gave him. One, Bildad, told him that his trouble had come upon him because he had done wrong. The misery—the mud—was necessary. 'Can the rush grow without mire?' Job needed the experience. Bildad was clever, but clever men often make mistakes. Here he was lecturing a man who was gathering jewels from the mire and the ashes all the time. You have heard of Job's patience, haven't you?

Where do you find mud? Answer that question to yourself. I see a little boy pass my window every morning. He delivers papers. Another rings the bell and leaves the milk-can on the doorstep. They both look quite happy. You may not have work like theirs to do, but are there never days at school and at home when you want to say 'Ugh!'

Your fathers and mothers know that there is a meaning in having to wade through mud. It makes men and women brave and strong. It makes them patient too. We all—like the rush by the river—need the mud. Don't complain about it; where mud is, there is more than a mere chance of finding jewels.

II.

Living Letters.

'Ye are an epistle of Christ,'—2 Co 3³.

What is an epistle? An epistle is just a letter. St. Paul is writing to the Christians at Corinth, and he tells them that they are letters of Christ.

Now that seems a strange thing to say, does it not? I wonder what Paul means by it. What does it mean to be a letter of Christ? And how does Christ write His letters?

Well, when Jesus was on earth we never hear of His writing any letters. Only once do we hear of His writing at all, and that time He wrote on the ground. St. Paul wrote a number of letters. He wrote epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians and others; he wrote two long letters to his friend Timothy, one to Titus, and one to Philemon.

So far as we know Jesus never wrote any letters of that kind. And yet He was always writing letters. Every day He was writing them, and some of the letters He wrote carried His message into far distant lands. And the wonderful bit of it was that Jesus did not stop writing His letters when He left the world. He went on writing them, and He is still writing them every day.

How does Jesus write His letters? He writes them on the hearts of men and women, and boys and girls. When He wants to let the world know something about Himself, He takes a boy or a girl and He writes a little bit of Himself on them and then He sends them out to the world; and if they are faithful letters, if they are brave, and true, and honourable, and kind, then the world knows a little more of what Christ is like.

MACMILLAN'S LIST

Folk-Lore in the Old Testament:

Studies in Comparative Religion, Legend, and Law.

By Sir J. G. FRAZER, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., Author of 'The Golden Bough,' 'Totemism and Exogamy,' etc. 3 Vols. 8vo, **37s. 6d.** net.

Part I. The Early Ages of the World. Part II. The Patriarchal Age. Part III. The Times of the Judges and Kings. Part IV. The Law.

Preparing the Way:

The Influence of Judaism of the Greek Period on the Earliest Development of Christianity.

By FRANK STREATFIELD, B.D. Crown 8vo, **5s.** net.

The Times.—"This short and scholarly study of the period between the Old and New Testaments, or rather of the three centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, is divided into two parts, the first dealing with the life and thought of that time, and the second with its language."

Religion Behind the Front and After the War.

By the Rev. NEVILLE S. TALBOT, Author of 'Thoughts on Religion at the Front.' Crown 8vo.

[Shortly.]

The Re-Evangelisation of England.

Being Studies in Religious Reconstruction.

By CYRIL HEPHER, Canon of Winchester, Author of 'Fruits of Silence,' etc. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo.

[Shortly.]

Faith and Freedom:

Being Constructive Essays in the Application of Modernist Principles to the Doctrines of the Church.

By ALFRED FAWKES, CHAS. E. RAVEN, HAROLD ANSON, W. SCOTT PALMER, A. CLUTTON-BROCK, WINIFRED MERCIER, and CHARLES H. S. MATTHEWS (EDITOR). Crown 8vo, **6s.** net.

The Glasgow Herald.—"The book reveals throughout a temper of reasonableness and charity which will appeal to those who understand the need for fresh thinking on the great themes of the Christian faith."

The Three Kingdoms:

A Young People's Guide to the Christian Faith.

By the Rev. F. G. GODDARD, M.A., B.D. With Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL. Crown 8vo, **3s. 6d.** net.

The Religion of the Beatitudes.

A Study of Christ's Teaching based on Addresses delivered at All Hallows, Lombard Street, during Lent, 1917.

By the Rev. MINOS DEVINE, M.A. Crown 8vo, **4s. 6d.** net.

The Times.—"Those who remember Mr. Devine's 'Ecclesiastes'; or, the Confessions of an Adventurous Soul," will know how well qualified he is to adopt this fresh and welcome method of dealing with the lessons of the Bible."

The Gospel of the Cross.

Written after a Conference of the Swanwick Free Church Fellowship by J. R. COATES, C. H. DODD, W. F. HALLIDAY, MALCOLM SPENCER, and OLIVE WYON. Crown 8vo, **4s. 6d.** net.

The Church Family Newspaper.—"A spirit of very real devotion breathes through this valuable little work, which cannot fail to be helpful to many a reader."

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON, W.C. 2.

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.

The Metaphysical Theory of the State.

By PROF. L. T. HOBHOUSE, D.Litt. **7s. 6d.** net.
A brief analysis of the political principles of Hegel and his English followers.

A New Volume in 'The Library of Philosophy.'

Social Purpose: A Contribution to a Philosophy of Civic Society.

By PROF. H. J. W. HETHERINGTON and PROF. J. H. MUIRHEAD, LL.D. **10s. 6d.** net.

The Relationship between the Mystical and the Sensible Worlds.

By HERBERT N. G. NEWLYN. **4s. 6d.** net.

'As publishers of scientific and sociological treatises, Messrs. George Allen and Unwin Ltd. have justly earned a reputation. This has been added to by the publication of "The Relationship between the Mystical and the Sensible Worlds."'

Edinburgh Evening News.

The Hour and The Church: An Appeal to the Church of England.

By A. MAUDE ROYDEN. **2s.** net.

'I hope everyone will read Miss Royden's book. It is marked by all her usual power.'—'ARTIFEX' in the *Manchester Guardian*.

Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

By REV. WALTER J. CAREY, Chaplain, R.N. **2s.** net.

'Chapters by a thoughtful, forward-looking Anglican, whose simple directness of style makes its appeal.'—*Times*.

The Builders: A Story and Study of Masonry.

By J. FORT NEWTON, Litt.D. **7s. 6d.** net.

'Will prove almost as interesting to non-Masons as to Masons, and it was a wise step to bring out an English edition of a work which had already made a great name for itself in America.'

Evening Standard.

RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM ST., LONDON, W.C. 1.

Cambridge University Press

The Problem of the Fourth Gospel.

By H. LATIMER JACKSON, D.D., of Christ's College, Cambridge, sometime Hulsean Lecturer. Demy 8vo. **6s.** net

"Dr Latimer Jackson is an erudite and accurate scholar, who has made himself acquainted with all the best books in the vast literature on the Johannine writings. His treatment of the subject is sober and judicious, and may be recommended as a good statement of the controversy in its present state."—*The Times*

The Elements of New Testament

Greek. A Method of Studying the Greek New Testament, with Exercises. By REV. H. P. V. NUNN, M.A. Second edition. Crown 8vo. **4s.** net. Key, **2s. 6d.** net

"It is being more and more realized that there has arisen a class of students of the Greek Testament who possess no previous knowledge of classical Greek, and various attempts have been made to provide books suitable to their needs. 'The Elements of New Testament Greek' is likely to prove very useful for this purpose, and may be used in conjunction with the same writer's 'Short Syntax of New Testament Greek.' There is a decided need for books of this kind at the present time."—*The Church Times*

The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.

The following have recently been published:—

The Book of Deuteronomy (R.V.). Edited by Sir GEORGE ADAM SMITH. **6s. 6d.** net

The Book of Job (R.V.). Edited by A. B. DAVIDSON, LL.D., and H. C. O. LANCASTER, M.A. **5s.** net

Obadiah and Jonah (R.V.). Edited by H. C. O. LANCASTER, M.A. **2s. 6d.** net

Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4: C. F. Clay, Manager

LIBRARY OF THEOLOGY

(SECTION TWO).

Large Crown 8vo, Maroon cloth, 2s. net each (postage 6d.).

This Series offers the greatest possible value in good literature at a modest price. Each is written by a master of his subject, and every volume has proved its worth by large sales in more expensive form.

NEW VOLUMES READY ARE :

The Travels of the Heart.

By DINSDALE T. YOUNG.

The Throne Room of the Soul.

By C. G. DONEY, Ph.D.

The Witness of Israel.

By W. J. MOULTON, M.A.

Studies in the Old Testament.

By GEORGE JACKSON, B.A.

Apostolic Ministry.

By J. SCOTT LIDGETT, M.A., D.D.

The Bane and the Antidote.

By W. L. WATKINSON, D.D.

Twenty-one other volumes have been issued.

Full list sent on request, post free.

God's Argument with England :

An Ancient Word for Modern Times.

By R. MOFFAT GAUTREY.

Paper wrapper, 1s. net (postage 1½d.).

Wesley and Whitefield.

By H. MALDWYN HUGHES, M.A., D.D.

Crown 8vo, boards, 2s. net (postage 3½d.).

A succinct account of the Evangelical Revival and its two outstanding leaders.

John's Ideal City, and other Sermons.

By WILLIAM WAKINSHAW.

Large crown 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d. net (postage 6d.).

'Every sermon carries the Message of the Gospel, and its content. That message is made vivid by illustration and impressive by the speaker's manifest earnestness.'—*Expository Times*.

CHOICE DEVOTIONAL BOOKS.

The Threshold Grace.

Meditations in the Psalms.

By PERCY C. AINSWORTH.

Cloth, 1s. 3d. net (postage 1½d.).

Will charm the reader by its sympathy with weakness, and the constancy of its uplook to God.

The Unveiled Heart.

The Private Prayers of the late Walter James.

Edited by E. T. CARRIER.

Cloth, 1s. 3d. net (postage 1½d.).

A series of prayers, simple, brief, and direct.

The Practice of the Presence of God.

By BROTHER LAWRENCE.

Wrapper in white and gold. 6d. net (postage 1d.).

CHARLES H. KELLY,
25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT.

Messrs. T. & T. CLARK have now published the Second Volume (Completion) of

THE DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

Vol. I.: AARON—LYSTRA.

Vol. II.: MACEDONIA—ZION.

In cloth, 25/- net per vol.

In Half-Morocco, 32/- net per vol.

The contributors to Vol. II. include :—PROFESSORS D. S. ADAM, J. S. BANKS, H. COWAN, R. A. FALCONER, R. S. FRANKS, A. E. GARVIE, A. R. GORDON, G. BUCHANAN GRAY, A. J. GRIEVE, KIRSOPP LAKE, R. LAW, J. W. LIGHTLEY, W. LOFTHOUSE, A. MAIN, D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, J. MOFFATT, R. WADDY MOSS, W. J. MOULTON, A. PLUMMER, H. WHEELER ROBINSON, A. SOUTER, J. STALKER, J. STRAHAN, J. TASKER, and DAWSON WALKER.

'This Dictionary will be of unspeakable service to all students. It is in every way equal to the other standard Dictionaries for which we owe Dr. Hastings so large a debt. It is likely to be one of the most useful and most popular of his great series. It takes up the history of the Church where the 'Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels' leaves it, and carries it down to the end of the first century.'—*London Quarterly Review*.

N.B.—Owing to the great and steadily increasing cost of production a further advance in the prices of books seems inevitable. In the meantime prices remain as in Messrs. Clark's latest Catalogue, but immediate advantage should be taken of those prices. Please send for copy of latest Catalogue and Prospectuses of Standard Works in Theological and Biblical Literature.

Edinburgh : **T. & T. CLARK,** London :
38 George St. Stationers' Hall.

Now Jesus is still in need of letters. He can never have too many of them. And He wants to write on you and on me. Don't you think it is a tremendous honour to be a letter of Christ? If Jesus came into this church to-day and chose you to run a message for Him, wouldn't you feel proud and glad? Well, Jesus *is* here though you cannot see Him, and He wants to send a special message by you to the world. I don't know what that message is, but I know nobody can take it quite so well as you.

There are three things I would like you to remember.

1. The first is that if we are not allowing Jesus to write on us, we are letting other things write on us. We can't stay just blank sheets of paper. Satan is always busy dipping his pen in the ink. If we are not allowing Jesus to write on us, then we are letting sin, or care, or the love of pleasure, or self, or money write their message. And their writing is not beautiful. Jesus' writing is always beautiful, but the writing of these things is black and ugly.

2. And the second thing I want you to remember is that Jesus can't write on us unless we let Him. He has many beautiful things to tell us and to tell by us, but we must be willing to be His letters. We must give Him permission to write on us.

3. Lastly, if we become Jesus' letters we must take care not to allow the writing to get blurred.

In the libraries of Europe are wonderful old parchments called palimpsests. These parchments have had a strange history. Originally they were covered with writing of great value—portions of the Old and New Testament or fragments from the works of famous Latin and Greek authors. But in the Middle Ages parchment became very scarce, and the monks, not realizing the value of these old manuscripts, took the parchments and washed or scraped off the writing. Then they covered them with their own writings—legends and treatises of little value. And these wonderful manuscripts would have remained lost to the world if modern scholars had not guessed what was hidden underneath the writing of the monks. Perhaps they saw a word here and there that had been imperfectly erased, and they treated the parchments with acids so that the original writing was brought out again—faintly perhaps, but still so that it might be read after a fashion.

There are some of Christ's letters that are just

like these palimpsests. They have covered up His writing with their own foolish scrawls and mistakes. They have become so cross, or so unkind, or so selfish, that other people find it very difficult to recognize in them the hand-writing of Jesus. But we need never be like that. The best way to prevent it is to take our letters to Jesus every day and ask Him to renew the writing. Then the characters will always be fresh and clear, and wherever we go the world will be able to read the beautiful message of Jesus.

III.

Money-Boxes.

'Jehoiada the priest took a chest, and bored a hole in the lid of it.'—2 Kings 12⁹.

Did you know that a money-box was mentioned in the Bible?—one with a hole in the lid too. You will find all about it in the twelfth chapter of the Second Book of Kings. If you look at the ninth verse you will see that 'Jehoiada the priest took a chest, and bored a hole in the lid of it, and set it beside the altar, on the right side as one cometh into the house of the Lord: and the priests that kept the door put therein all the money that was brought into the house of the Lord.' The chest with the hole in the lid was a kind of collection plate. It stood in the Temple, and the people gave the priests their offerings to put into it. When it was full it was carried away to the palace of the king himself, and the high priest and the king's chancellor opened it there, and counted the offerings in the chest, and tied them up in bags. Then they used the money to pay for repairing and beautifying the Temple, which at that time was sadly in need of repair.

Now, our text makes us think of money-boxes and savings-banks, and I want to talk to you about them for a little while this morning. If you come to think of it, there are just three things you can do with your money.

1. The first thing is—spend it. That is the shortest way to dispose of it. You keep it only long enough to see whether it is a penny or a sixpence, and then you fly along to the nearest shop and buy something with it, and you don't see that penny or that sixpence any more.

2. The second thing is—save it. You put the penny or the sixpence into your savings-bank. At first sight this does not seem at all a nice way to

dispose of your money. In fact you grudge hiding it away in a box, and you drop it very slowly into the hole, especially if the box is one that needs to be broken before you can get the money out again. Putting the money in there makes it feel so safe. Yes, but then it is safe, and you look forward to the day when you will see it once more. And as the bank grows heavier you begin to be keener on adding to its store, and you grow rather proud of it, and try to count up how much there is inside. It is quite easy to remember that one half-crown and those three shillings, but the sixpences are rather difficult, and when you come to the pennies you get dreadfully mixed and give it up.

At last the glorious day arrives when the box is to be opened. Father or mother does it for you; and as you watch the coins tumbling in a heap on the table, and as you pile them up each after its kind till the penny pile threatens to topple over, you feel it has been worth denying yourself all those little things you might have bought, for now you will be able to buy something of real value.

If you haven't got a savings-bank already, start one as soon as you can. It is a grand habit to be able to deny yourself to-day for the sake of to-morrow. Of course I don't ask you to drop in every penny and every sixpence. I don't wish you to grow greedy of money or mean in spending it. That would be ten times worse than spending your money foolishly.

3. But there is a third thing you can do with your money, and it is better than spending it or saving it. You can put it in God's bank. What! Has God a savings-bank? Certainly He has. And every penny you give away to others goes straight into it. By giving it away you are not losing it, you are just giving it to God to keep. That sounds wonderful; but it is true. It is a splendid thing to have a savings-bank on the dining-room mantelpiece, but it is far more splendid to have a savings-bank in heaven. The money that we give to others from love or pity, we do not see again on earth, but God treasures it; and one day, when we go to live with Him He will tell us how much we have in His savings-bank. And won't we be ashamed, and try to hide our faces if the sum He mentions is very, very small?

But we must not run away with the idea that God despises small sums. You see He counts quite differently from us. Suppose you have only

a penny, and you are looking forward to spending it on something you specially want, and suppose you give it away instead of spending on yourself—you must not think that God will count that penny a sum too small to notice. Not a bit of it! He will count it as much as if you had had ten shillings and had given every one of the ten away. You see you gave what you could—your all.

But it is not money only that God wishes you to put in His bank. He wishes you to put in kind thoughts and loving deeds. All these count as coin in God's money-box. So if you come out of a sweet shop with a bag of sweets in your pocket and you see two little chaps outside gluing their noses against the pane and choosing what they would buy if they only had a penny, don't forget to give them a good half of your bag of sweets. That will be so much in God's bank.

Or if mother is looking tired out, and you have half an hour between lessons and bed-time, offer to run her errands or help her somehow. That will be dropping a sixpence in God's bank. You see there are hundreds of ways you can invest in it.

Let me tell you a story to finish. It is a really true story, and it happened not long ago.

On the outskirts of a certain great city there lived a little chap called Jimmie. His father was dead, but he had a mother, and a small brother named Bobbie, and a tiny baby sister. They were all very poor, so poor that Jimmie had often no shoes to cover his feet, and very little bread to fill his hungry mouth. By and by things grew worse, for his mother became ill, and could not work any longer. Then just when things were desperate something happened. An angel came to the house. At least she looked like an angel to Jimmie. She wore a grey cloak with sleeves like floating wings, and she had a bonnet with a long grey veil, and beneath the bonnet was a face—oh, so sweet! And she smiled at Jimmie and called him 'Old man.' She asked him if he knew the way to such and such a street in the city. Jimmie did. Then she told him that she had come to spend the afternoon with his mother, but that she wished to send a message to a certain house in that street. Would Jimmie take it? Of course Jimmie would. Then she took a look at Jimmie's bare red feet which he was rubbing one on the other to keep warm, and she drew sixpence out of her purse, and she said, 'It is a long road, and

you've no shoes, and there is snow on the ground, here's sixpence for you. 'Take the car!'

Jimmie sped off like an arrow, and mounted the car steps, and paid his threepenny fare like a man, and wasn't he just proud? When he reached the street, he found the house and delivered the message, and then he started out for home. Now something was worrying Jimmie, and it was that neither Bobbie nor Baby was sharing his treat. He wanted them to have a good time too. Just then he passed in front of one of those shops where cakes and biscuits and toys and sweets are gloriously mixed in the window. And suddenly Jimmie knew what he should do. Said he to himself, 'I'll run all the way home, and may be it won't hurt so awful, and then Bobbie can have that penny whistle, and baby will get that penny ball, and there'll be a penny over to buy a ha'penny cake for each of them.' So he marched into the shop and bought the penny whistle, and the penny

ball, and the two ha'penny cakes. And the woman actually put the cakes in a bag, and he stowed away the toys in the only pocket of his that hadn't holes. Then he ran all the road home, and whenever he stopped to take breath he had a peep into the bag and a peep into his pocket to be sure the things were still there. And when he got home, very hot and breathless, and showed the angel in the bonnet what he had done, and hoped she wouldn't be angry, she only smiled all the sweeter and said, 'Dear laddie, no.' As for Bobbie and Baby! You should have seen them! That's all!

Now Jimmie invested that day in God's bank. He invested not only three pennies but a great deal of love. And that is what God wants even more than pennies.

Boys and girls, make up your mind to-day that however small, however empty your savings-bank on earth may be, your savings-bank in heaven will, please God, be both large and full.

'Christ Crucified' for the Thought and Life of To-day.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

I.

HISTORY is to-day challenging doctrine, its facts our faith. Many find it difficult to reconcile what they have hitherto believed with what they are now experiencing. There is one doctrine, one object of faith, which is likely to find confirmation, and not challenge in the calamity of to-day; and that is the tragic mystery of the Cross of Jesus Christ. It is an interesting coincidence that just at this time there should appear two works dealing with the doctrine of the Atonement, in which thinkers may find much help in making more intelligible to themselves the fact and the truth of salvation by sacrifice.

(i.) In no mere form of words, but in all sincerity we may express our gratitude to God that Dr. Denney left the lectures, which owing to his last illness he was prevented from delivering, ready for publication, for this is a very precious legacy. His book on *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*¹ can be placed alongside of Bushnell's, M'Leod Campbell's, and Dale's as a great

contribution to the greatest of all subjects with which the Christian theologian can deal. If it does not contribute any new conception, it so expounds the conception adopted in the light of the knowledge and thought of to-day as to make that conception more intelligible and credible than it has ever been made before. As compared with his previous contributions on the same subject, it is a worthy consummation, in all respects excelling all he had hitherto accomplished.

(ii.) Principal Franks is to be congratulated on the conclusion of a task that has engaged him about twenty years, in the two volumes of *A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ in its Ecclesiastical Development*.² A work of this kind has been greatly needed, and it will be much appreciated, as the book is marked by adequacy and accuracy of treatment; and what makes it the more valuable is that while the author supplies the necessary connective exposition and criticism he keeps himself in the background, and allows the theologians

¹ Hodder & Stoughton, 1917. 7s. 6d.

² Hodder & Stoughton, 1918. Two vols. 18s.

with whom he deals to present their doctrine as far as possible in their own words.

(iii.) Although not of so recent publication, a small book, the value of which must not be measured by the size, also deserves mention, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, by J. K. Mozley, M.A.,¹ a handbook of special usefulness to students. For the sake of comparison with Dr. Denney's work at some points, a fourth book, although of far slighter structure and less value for students, may be mentioned. Dr. David Smith's *The Atonement in the Light of History and the Modern Spirit*,² is intended as a popular presentation to remove current difficulties.

I.

A brief account of each of these books may be given. (i.) Dr. Denney with great mastery not only introduces but commends his treatment of his subject in exhibiting at the outset *the experimental basis of the doctrine*. It is not a bit of special pleading, but an example of the very best kind of Christian apologetic. Following a logical rather than a chronological order he first deals with *Reconciliation in the Christian Thought of the Past*, and then the *New Testament Doctrine of Reconciliation*. This order may be called logical for two reasons. (a) While it would be unjust to deny the influence of the New Testament on *The Christian Thought of the Past*, yet what the survey of the teaching of Athanasius, Anselm, Aquinas, and others shows is that the dominating categories were not the characteristic ones of the New Testament, but rather the New Testament materials were often forced into moulds of thought foreign to them, and derived from other sources. (b) We can to-day get nearer the actual teaching of the New Testament than any previous generation, and Dr. Denney's own constructive treatment is based more directly and comprehensively on the New Testament than are the theories of the Atonement of which he gives an account. He is constructing as he expounds and criticises, and we are being prepared for his own contribution by the previous discussion. He does not deal with the Old Testament teaching, and he states his reason quite clearly: 'Instead of going to the Old Testament to find what He is in these characters, we have to fasten our eyes on Him to see what the essential

truth of these Old Testament ideas amounts to' (p. 123). In his constructive statement he shows first of all *the need of reconciliation*, and then *reconciliation as on the one hand achieved by Christ, and as on the other realized in human life*. We might say that the key-words of these chapters are sin, grace, and faith.

(ii.) Principal Franks has excluded from his work both 'any account of the Biblical material of the subject' and any 'construction,' for the same reason, that 'each would demand greater fulness of treatment than belongs to the scale of my history' (Preface, ix). His own personal contribution to the discussion of the subject is found in the connective material of his record. 'This course of development,' he says, 'has its model points in the four great syntheses, in which the various factors that have contributed to the doctrine of the work of Christ have from time to time found a relative settlement. Into these syntheses the threads of doctrine are gathered up, and out of them again they diverge. The gist of my book is accordingly to be found in the sections which treat of these syntheses' (vii). It would be possible to conjecture from these historical summaries where the author's own sympathies lie. It is to be hoped that having undergone the discipline which the preparation of this history has involved, the author's modesty will not prevent his offering us in a subsequent volume his own constructive statement.

(iii.) Mr. Mozley in seeking to provide a handbook for students has tried to cover the whole ground. The titles of his chapters are The Old Testament, The Testimony of the Synoptic Gospels, The New Testament Interpretation, The Atonement in Greek Theology, The Atonement in Latin Theology, Reformation and Post-Reformation Doctrine, and Towards a Doctrine. While the discussions are necessarily brief, yet they are marked by fulness of knowledge. What modern scholarship has to say about the Holy Scriptures is constantly kept in view. For instance, in the Old Testament discussion, the subject of sacrifice is treated from this standpoint, and the testimony of the Synoptic Gospels is discussed in relation to the liberal, the eschatological, and the positive schools of German theology. One instance of the suggestiveness of the treatment may be given. As regards *the Servant of Jehovah* his comments are: In the first place, the prophetic and priestly lines of development meet in this great climax of sacrificial

¹ Duckworth & Co., 1915. 2s. 6d.

² Hodder & Stoughton, 1918. 5s.

death conceived as a personal moral action. Secondly, there is the express teaching of the expiation of sins through vicarious suffering' (pp. 26, 27). After a careful discussion of modern difficulties in regard to the doctrine, he states his own acceptance of the doctrine fully expounded and defended by Dr. Denney. 'I do not therefore think that we need shrink from saying that Christ bore penal suffering for us and in our stead' (pp. 216-217).

(iv.) Dr. David Smith's book does not attempt completeness of treatment. He discusses *Atonement and Evolution* in order to justify the doctrine of a fall of man, not from perfection, but from innocence to sin. In the *Historic Preparations* he includes *The Messianic Hope*, and *The Rite of Sacrifice*. He states the Problem of the Atonement to be the statement of 'the eternal truth' about Christ and the Cross 'in the light of the fuller knowledge which is the Holy Spirit's gift to our generation' (p. 54). The three Historic Interpretations which alone he discusses are *The Ransom Theory*, *The Satisfaction Theory*, and *The Forensic Theory*, recognizing what measure of truth is in each, but also insisting on their very serious

defects. The two features of the *Modern Spirit* to which he calls attention are the creation of the science of historical criticism, and the revolutionizing of 'our conceptions of the origin and constitution of the physical universe' (p. 134). 'Here then,' he says, 'in these twin conceptions—the Fatherhood of God, and the organic unity of the human race—lies the mould which the modern spirit has furnished for a living doctrine of the Atonement, a rich and satisfying reinterpretation of the historic faith to the mind of our generation' (p. 135). He presents his own solution of the problem under four heads: (1) *Fatherhood and Sacrifice* (Christ's sacrifice reveals the heart of the Eternal Father); (2) *The Satisfaction of Man's Moral Instincts* (the necessity for an atoning sacrifice lies in man's sense that sin must be expiated in open confession and full reparation); (3) *Imputation and Heredity* (Christ's righteousness no less than Adam's sin can be imputed because of the solidarity of the race); (4) *Man's Offering to God* (by consent of will God's sacrifice must become man's offering). Lastly, it is shown in what respect this view is a *Word of Reconciliation*.

Contributions and Comments.

Dr. Field's Old Testament Revision Notes.

TRANSCRIBED FROM THE AUTHOR'S MS. BY THE
REV. JOHN HENRY BURN, B.D.

I.

[A FEW words of explanation may be advisable. Twenty-one years ago I had the privilege of contributing to the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES a short account of the life and literary work of the Rev. Frederick Field, LL.D., an original member of the Old Testament Revision Company, together with some specimens of the renderings and comments which he was in the habit of sending by post to the Secretary of the Company, his deafness precluding him from attendance at the meetings in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster. Since then, I have had access to an incomplete but still fairly

extensive set of these communications, now housed in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, so that I am able to offer the readers of this journal a further selection. As it will be convenient to have them all set forth in their proper order, I include some notes which have already appeared in print. Of course it is to be understood that these notes, which accompanied Dr. Field's retranslation of the Authorized Version for Revision purposes, form a very small portion of the assistance afforded by him to the cause he had so much at heart. An immense number of his emendations are to be found in the Revised Version: in the longer books they run into hundreds. Thus in Jeremiah there are more than 460 verses in which his retranslations are adopted without change in R.V. text, besides a great many others that manifestly owe their present form to his suggestion and advice. The same book contains 120 of his renderings in the margin. An examination of the

Appendix reveals the interesting fact that Dr. Field had independently arrived at the same conclusions as the American Revisers in more than one-third of the instances in which they differed so seriously from the English Company as to desire their suggestions to be put on record.—J. H. B.]

GENESIS 2²⁸. By a simple transposition, 'This now *is*,' the intention of Adam to distinguish the creature now brought to him from all former ones is clearly made out. 'This *is* now' would imply that she was not so before, which is *not* the sense intended. And the Hebrew word is not עַתָּה but הַעַתָּה, 'this time,' which the Revisers have substituted for A.V. 'now' in Gn 29³⁵, Jg 15⁸. Professor Chenery has proposed 'This time it is bone,' etc.; but נָא is clearly 'this (creature).'

GENESIS 3⁶. 'Good for food,' A.V. and R.V. See also Gn 2⁹ 6²¹ (*bis*). But in Gn 1²⁹ 30, where A.V. has 'for meat,' R.V. (1st Revision) has given 'for food,' but R.V. (2nd Revision) goes back to 'meat.' Referring to the N.T. Revision, I find that the rule is to retain the 'meat' of the A.V. whenever the Greek word is βρώσις, βρώμα, or βρώματα (only excepting 2 Co 9¹⁰, ἄρτον εἰς βρώσιν, 'bread for food,' where A.V. also has 'food'; and two places in St. Luke, where the Greek is βρώματα, A.V. 'meat,' R.V. 'food'). Where A.V. renders τροφή by 'meat,' R.V. rightly adopts 'food.' In the O.T. the LXX almost invariably render אָכַל, אָכְלָה and מֵאָכַל by βρώμα and βρώσις, preserving the etymology; in three instances only do they put τροφή for אָכַל, and in all three both A.V. and R.V. have 'meat.' On the same principle I would correct the following passages: Gn 2⁹ 3⁶ 6²¹ 9³, Lv 11³⁴ 25^{6, 7}, Dt 2^{6, 23}, etc. The only exception that occurs to me at present is Gn 41^{35, 36}; here the corn not being intended to be eaten, but to be stored up, it seems more convenient to call it 'food' than 'meat'; and so throughout the history of Joseph.

GENESIS 4⁷. Render: 'If thou bringest rightly, is it not well? and if not rightly, sin lieth at the door.' Most recent interpreters take שָׂאָה to be the infinitive used as a noun, in the sense of *elevatio*, understanding פָּנִים. I suppose our Translators did the same, but in the sense of *acceptance* in text and *excellency* in margin. So also Græco-Ven. ἀποις, but probably in the sense of *forgiveness* (as ἀπεῖν ἀμαρτίαν), since this Version usually follows the Chald. which here has *dimittetur tibi*.

It seems strange that all these should have ignored the regular construction of הִיטִיב with the infinitive mood, as לָכֵת "ה, *bene incidere* (Pr 30²⁰); הִיטִיב "ה, *bene pulsare* (Ezk 33³²), etc. Of the ancient Versions, the Septuagint only has adopted this construction, rightly rendering οὐκ ἐὰν ὁρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, though the remainder of this version is entirely wrong. Of commentators I know only L. De Dieu (*Crit. Sacr.* p. 6), who has preserved the Hebrew idiom: *Annon sive bene offeras, sive non bene, ad ostium peccatum cubat*. The reason for rejecting this construction seems to be the want of an *apodosis*; but this is rather a recommendation of it than otherwise, if it be considered that in the case of אָם, followed by אִם-לֹא, or ἐὰν . . . ἐὰν μὴ in Greek, the use of this figure (*ἀναπαιρόδοτον*) is well established. In Greek the most trite example is Lk 13⁹. In Hebrew we may refer to Ex 32³², and Dn 3¹⁵. See also 1 S 12¹⁴ R.V. For שָׂאָה in the sense of 'to bring an offering,' compare Dt 14²⁴, Ezk 20³¹. [After reading this note, the late Professor Eberhard Nestle wrote to the transcriber as follows: 'I believe it will interest you to learn that recently a paper was published on this passage (in a periodical which will not come to the knowledge of many scholars) which takes quite the same view as F. Field. Professor A. Ludwig of Prag wrote "Über Gen. 4⁷" in the *Sitzungsberichte der R. böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften: Classe für Philosophie, Geschichte und Philologie*, 1895. He shows—what is not unknown to Semitic scholars—that the use of the figure *ἀναπαιρόδοτον* is also in use in Arabic. I cannot quite agree with the rest of his article; especially I am angry with him that he repeats the grammatical mistake (as does also Spurrell in the second edition of his Notes on Genesis) to say that LXX presupposes רָבֵן, while the imperative of רָבֵן (as I pointed out several years ago in my *Marginalien*) must be רָבֵן; but I believe this testimony to the correctness of the philological instinct (if I may so) of F. Field will interest you.']

Cainan (Luke iii. 36).

In the genealogy of our Lord as given by St. Luke a name occurs which is not to be found in the Book of Genesis upon which this portion of the pedigree in question is based. St. Luke states

that he is the son of Arphaxad, but the passages in which Arphaxad is named know him not (Gn 10²⁴ 1¹²). Whence, then, does the Evangelist derive the name? It is from the LXX of these two passages in the Book of Genesis. St. Luke found the name there and inserted it in his history. If we take the Hebrew text as the sole source of historical information with regard to Arphaxad and his family, we are bound to hold that St. Luke has introduced unhistorical matter into this genealogy. In that case what becomes of the doctrine of verbal inspiration? Of course the desperate expedient might be adopted of asserting that the name Cainan, though not in our present Hebrew text, may have been in an earlier Hebrew text upon which the LXX was based. But what, we might reply, is the use of verbal inspiration if the exact text has not been miraculously preserved for our use? And we might ask a further question, what would be the use of having such an infallible text if we had not infallible persons to explain it and comment upon it?

JOHN WILLCOCK.

Lerwick.

Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do' (Luke xxiii. 34).

I WOULD like to offer a remark or two on the above with reference to the article which appeared on it in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of October 1916. In that article under Section III., 'The Plea,' we read: 'It is wilful, deliberate, conscious transgression for the forgiveness of which the Crucified Saviour pleads'; and 'all are responsible, all have disobeyed conscience, all have wilfully trifled with their souls'; and 'ignorance gives no man a claim on God'; and this, which is something quite different from the sense of the foregoing quotations: 'Pilate condemns a man whom he knows to be innocent,' because, in that case, Pilate is *not* ignorant, but knows. There is also the quotation from Matthew Henry to the same effect, and what would seem to be the summing up of this teaching in the last paragraph on p. 28, with, however, this important qualification: 'if knowledge was within our reach.' And then it is strange and confusing that all that teaching about the ignorance of men and God's attitude to it should seem to be completely upset by the quotation from Dr. Smith's *Christian Counsel*, in which occurs the German

proverb: 'Where there is no knowledge there is no sin.'

Now what I felt about all this was that it was only an attempt to apologize for the form of our Saviour's prayer; it is certainly an effort to explain our Saviour's words in a different way from that which they suggest to be their true and natural meaning, and that is a method of Bible interpretation which must always be unsatisfactory.

I think we get near to our Saviour's meaning by thinking of Him as the Divine Advocate pleading for His clients, and presenting on their behalf the best plea that He can get, which is: 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' But we say, 'Did they not know?' and we must reply that 'they did know very much.' 'I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me'; and why did they not? because they knew, and knew that the common people knew; and so all through His ministry they knew, and could not help knowing, that they were acting foolishly and sinfully; but, while that was the case, how much they did not know; they knew, and to that extent they were guilty, but behind that partial knowledge there was that vast bank of ignorance which made Paul say, 'Had they known, they would not have crucified the Lord of life and glory.' And this, of course, is true of all sin—that when we sin we know we are doing wrong, and yet, at the same time, know so little compared with what we do not know. And so we have in our Saviour's great prayer an example of that wonderful compression of thought which is so evident in the whole of the New Testament, and by which He meant, 'Forgive them the sins which they have committed, and committed knowingly, and therefore guiltily, and chiefly the sin of crucifying their Friend and Saviour, and do it, Father! for this reason, that there is so much they do not know about what they are doing; so much that makes them like children playing with fire—disobedient because told by their parents not to touch it; and yet to be pitied, and forgiven, and excused on account of their ignorance of the fire, and of themselves, and of the disobedience of which they are guilty'; and so we can't get away from the plain meaning of our Saviour's words.

DONALD M. HENRY.

Whithorn.

1 Samuel xv.

THE incident recorded in this chapter is taken by many to justify the statement that war is right, and is a necessary exercise, 'for *God ordered war*, in Old Testament times.'

The question is one which might require an article, or, perhaps, a book, for its adequate discussion; but the writer of this note would come to the heart of the matter by inquiring:

1. What is meant by Inspiration, in reference to

(a) The books of the Old Testament.

(b) The prophets, or preachers, of Jewish History.

2. Are the results of Higher Criticism and modern research to be *ignored*, as being wholly unsound and unchristian?

Allowing that Inspiration is not mechanical, and that verbal inerrancy should not be accepted with regard either to the writings of priests and preachers or to their utterances, may we not put the matter somewhat after the following manner?—

A. Jesus uses the sacred writings (no single Canon of the Old Testament being fixed, in His day) to *illustrate* His teaching, not (as did some of the Evangelists and Apostles) to *prove* its truth. Therefore, the sanction He gives is not of that wholesale and non-differentiating kind which would have prevented (had He adopted it) His 'fulfilling' by *abrogating* dicta of the past.

B. a. The Old Testament books show that the Jews learnt slowly that there is one God—the Creator of the Universe.

β. They were inspired, or illuminated, to see that polytheism and idolatry were dishonouring to God, and, further, were *wrong*.

γ. As the Voice of God, through Conscience, convicted them of the wrong, they (led by their preachers, or proclaimers) saw the duty of stamping out the wrong.

So far, so good. But:

δ. They regarded God as *their* God. Of other peoples it is said, 'Thou never bearest rule over them. They were not called by Thy Name.'

ε. Therefore, there was no idea of *converting* them to the One, True God; and the evil must be stamped out by slaughtering the evil-doers (youths and maidens, the aged and infirm, and infants and sucklings, and even animals owned by them).

C. The *idea* of *stamping out the evil* was right—the result of inspiration, or illumination. Was the *method* divinely ordered, or was the preacher speaking 'in the Name' but uttering his own thoughts? So far as *his* conscience was informed, he believed that the method was ordered, equally with the duty of stamping out the evil. So he bade the people go forth to slaughter 'in the Name of God.'

D. Did Jesus Christ reveal to man the *mind* of the Father? Did He adopt the *methods* of the Father?

E. a. Jesus Christ declared the slaughtering method to be wrong. ('Ye know not *what spirit* ye are of.')

β. He taught His disciples, and bade them go forth and teach others. Teach—convert—baptize. (Unlike Mahomet, He did not say, Teach and, if they will not listen, kill.)

γ. Even after the Resurrection and the Ascension, the disciples regarded God as the God of the Jews, and they were astonished when the Holy Spirit was given to the Samaritans, and were angry (some of them) when Paul allowed that the Gentiles would come to God direct, without adopting Judaism, or Jewish Churchmanship.

3. Jesus Christ, therefore, proclaimed the new method—the Divine method.

F. Are we *justified* in asserting that *God-ordered war*?

It is not a question of the dictum of this Father, or that Father, of this Bishop, or that Canon. It is a question of Truth.

Who is the Criterion—Samuel, or Jesus Christ?

WALTER G. WHITE.

Doddington, Oxon.

The Greek and the Aramaic in the Gospels.

By THE REV. T. H. WEIR, B.D., M.R.A.S., LECTURER IN ARABIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

It may probably be now taken for granted that the discourses of Jesus were spoken in Aramaic, and for the most part in His native Galilean dialect. They were first gathered together in that language and, as stated by Papias in the familiar passage of Eusebius, rendered by various hands into Greek. The correctness of this statement of Papias is vouched for by the number of places in which the report of a saying in one Gospel differs from that in another, and in which the different expressions can be most easily accounted for as variant translations of the same underlying Aramaic text. When, therefore, the critic of the N.T. has worked his way back to the oldest form of the Greek text which he can reach, he has not yet finished his task; for he has still to ask himself, what was the Aramaic lying at the back of this oldest Greek? This Aramaic archetype can be reached most surely in those cases in which the form of the Greek in one Gospel differs from that in another, and in which both forms go back into the same Aramaic. In such cases the critic may be fairly confident about his results. Perhaps the most familiar example is the use by St. Matthew of the expression 'kingdom of heaven' for the expression 'kingdom of God' used in the other Gospels (cf. Mt 13¹¹ as contrasted with Mk 4¹¹ and Lk 8¹⁰), or the various ways of translating the Oriental phrase, 'Verily I say to you' (Mt 19²³, Lk 11⁵¹ 7⁹ 9²⁷ etc.). But there are also a number of the sayings of Jesus of which we have only a single report to go by, and in which we cannot help feeling that the Greek text which we have does not represent the exact meaning of the original words. Several examples of such passages have already been given in the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and a few more are by the courtesy of the Editor set down here.

The kingdom of heaven is compared (Mt 13³³) to 'leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal.' 'Took and hid' is a rare Hebraism. Absalom 'took and reared up to himself a pillar' (2 S 18¹⁸ and often). But why 'hid'? The Greek word is ἐνέκρυπεν, to hide in a

thing. This verb, however, is used by the LXX translators to render the Hebrew verb 'to bake' in Ezk 4¹², and they regularly translate the corresponding noun meaning 'a cake' by ἐγκρυφίας. The natural English equivalent, therefore, of the Hebrew at any rate would be 'leaven which a woman took and baked in three measures of meal.'

In Lk 16²³ the rich man 'lifted up his eyes, being in torments' (ἐν βασάνοις). The fact of being in torment does not appear to be an appropriate cause for his eyes being cast down. The Greek expression is employed by the LXX to render various Hebrew terms, and amongst others, in Ezk 16^{52. 54, 32^{24. 30}}, *klimmah*, 'shame.' We should, therefore, probably read, 'lifted up his eyes, being ashamed.'

In St. Luke's (6²⁶) 'Woe (unto you), when all men shall speak well of you!' the Greek καλῶς ἐπῶσι ὑμᾶς appears to be a literal translation of the Hebrew phrase which occurs in Gn 37⁴, 'they could not speak peaceably to him,' the only case in which the Hebrew verb 'to speak' takes the direct accusative of the person spoken to, instead of a preposition. Perhaps, therefore, we should render, 'Woe, when all men speak you fair.'

The English Versions speak very frequently in the Gospels of people being 'healed' of their diseases, but constantly the Greek word so rendered is, not ἰᾶσθαι, but θεραπεύειν, which means rather to minister to or attend on the sick. In the O.T. it is never used by the LXX to translate the Hebrew word *rāfa*, which means 'to heal.' Only in Ec 38⁷ is it so used, and this is perhaps a reflexion upon the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus. Whatever the authors of the Gospels may have meant, they do not say that all the sick were cured.

The English Version of Mt 10²⁹, 'One of them (the sparrows) shall not fall to the ground without your Father,' gives us the impression that the sparrow falls *dead*, and this appears to be the meaning of the Greek πεσείται also. The common Hebrew verb, however, to which this Greek verb corresponds is *nāfal*. This again has not only the usual different senses of the verb 'to fall' in

English, but it has the special meaning of 'to alight.' Rebekah alighted (literally 'fell,' LXX κατεπήδησεν) from her camel (Gn 24⁶⁴), and Naaman from his chariot (2 K 5²¹, LXX ἐπέστρεψεν). The saying of Jesus would therefore mean that a sparrow does not even *alight* on the ground without God.

The centurion in Mt 8⁹ and Lk 7⁸ says, 'I am a man under authority' (ὕπὸ ἐξουσίας), but he goes on to explain what he means by saying that he has soldiers under him, to one of whom he says Go, and to another Come, and they obey. But surely this is to be a man *in* authority, not *under* it. The Semitic word for authority is *sultān*, and the verb means, not to be put under authority, but to be made *sultān*. Doubtless, therefore, what the centurion really said was that he was a man put *in*, not *under* authority.

The expression of John the Baptist in Mt 3⁸ and Lk 3⁸ also, 'Make, therefore, fruit worthy of repentance,' is a literal translation from the Greek, ἀξίον τῆς μετανοίας. On the analogy, however, of such phrases as 'worthy of punishment' (He 10²⁹) or 'worthy of acceptance' (1 Ti 1¹⁵), 'worthy of repentance' should mean 'deserving of repentance' or 'fit to be repented of.' But this is just the opposite of the sense required, which is, 'Make fruits *not* deserving of repentance.' The fact is that the Greek word ἀξίος ('worthy') here seems to be a translation of the Hebrew word *ben* ('son'), as it is also in Dt 25²: 'And if the culprit be worthy of beating,' literally, 'a son of beating.' 'A son of beating' means 'deserving of blows,' as the Greek has it (ἀξίος πληγῶν); but 'a son of repentance' would not in this passage mean 'deserving of repentance,' but 'the outcome of repentance.' The point is that the Greek phrase means 'Do works which will lead to repentance,' but the Hebrew phrase means that the works are the sons or daughters of the repentance, that is, the repentance produces the works, not the works

the repentance. It may be mentioned in passing that the use of the singular 'fruit' in Mt., whilst the plural 'fruits' is used in Lk., is simply due to the fact of each of these being an equally legitimate rendering of the collective Hebrew word *pri*. The LXX also translate now by the singular and now by the plural.

Lk 14^{12, 13}: When you make a feast 'do not invite your friends,' but 'invite the poor.' The usual verb for 'to invite' to a feast is in the Gospels καλεῖν, and in the papyri ἐρωτᾶν (Milligan, *Selections*, Nos. 23 and 39; for καλεῖν, cf. Mt 22^{3f}, 1 Co 10²⁷, and the preceding verses in Lk.); but here the word is φωνεῖν, which properly means 'to shout,' 'call aloud.' The English Version gets over the difficulty very neatly by translating by 'call' instead of their usual 'bid.' In Hebrew the common word for 'to shout' or 'call out' is *qārā*, which is also the usual word for 'to invite' (1 S 9²²). In the former sense it is rendered in the LXX of Jer 17¹¹, Dn 4¹¹ (also Theodotion) 5¹¹ by φωνεῖν, and in the present passage the original translator appears by inadvertence to have used the same word.

The sentence in Lk 22²⁶, 'He that is greater among you, let him be as the younger,' does not present a correct antithesis. The reason, no doubt, is that in Hebrew and Aramaic one word denotes 'greater' and 'elder,' and one word also 'less' and 'younger.' The saying, therefore, would naturally run either, 'He that is elder among you let him be as the younger,' or, 'He that is greater among you let him be as the less' (cf. Mt 20²⁶, Mk 10⁴⁴).

However often one were to read through the Gospels, it is probable that at every reading he would notice some expressions out of which, on being turned back into the underlying Hebrew or Aramaic, it is possible to get a slightly better sense than is found in the Greek texts which have come down to us.

Entre Nous.

WHAT THEY SAY.

THE secret—which is also the reward—of all learning lies in the passion for the search.¹

The inventions of one age are always in process of becoming the conventions, the tyrants, of the next.¹

Donne's sermons contain (as I hold) the most magnificent prose ever uttered from an English pulpit, if not the most magnificent prose ever spoken in our tongue.¹

Nobody reads sermons in these days, and few even trouble to attend them. For reasons which we will examine on another occasion, the once glorious art of preaching has perished out of our midst. The tradition is there—laid up in Donne's *Sermons*: 'laid up, not lost!'¹

Breaches of the universal moral law, such as drunkenness, theft or fornication, have not caused a hundredth part of the suffering that has been caused by perverse morality, by religious persecution, by fanatical patriotism, by belief in the sacred rights of property.²

The Church does not exist to help the State in the maintenance of its morality, of its order, or of itself. Nor does it exist to work any kind of political change in the State or between States. Therefore it is not called upon to take part in any kind of secular dispute, whether it be a war between nations or a class war. Its function is to teach and to practise those principles which alone can put an end to all conflicts between men or classes or nations.²

The extension of the family idea involves the belief not simply that we must tolerate one another, but that we must learn to appreciate one another. In the little tribe among the mountains overlooking the Dead Sea, rent by diverse factions, trusting the one to Assyria and the other to Egypt, the vast warring world-powers of the day, there rose a man who had the audacity to proclaim that Israel should be a third with Egypt and Assyria, her two giant enemies. To him it was given to think in family terms of a world rent with

war, and he saw through the hatreds and prejudices of his day that each needed the other for the fulfilment of its own best life. That stupendous vision has come down through the ages. Is the world yet ripe for it? Dare we express it in national policies? Where is the statesman who can make it a reality for the relations of America and Japan, Germany and England, Austria and Serbia?³

No amount of misunderstanding and vulgarisation and partisanship, not all the bad pictures and hymns, not all the apologies and explanations and flatteries, have availed to make Christ ridiculous to any man. The fiercest atheist may make his jokes about God; he does not make them about Christ, but only reproaches Christians with being unlike Him.⁴

My brethren in the ministry, we must not be carried away by the people who tell you that we shall have to shorten our services considerably and only give ten minutes addresses if we are to get and retain these young fellows. The men who talk that way are the men who do not want to make sermons. It is an insult to the intelligence of these lads. If you want to make strong Christian characters of them, you will have to teach them in the things of God and stir their hearts to gracious impulses. I have spoken for fifty minutes to the men just before they crossed the Channel on one occasion; and I was not telling them stories. My talk was about the grandeur of the life in God: the safety of the life committed to His keeping.⁵

A man who can say the same thing twice is a man who has ceased to feel.⁶

ON CERTAIN TOPICS.

Faith.

The doctrine of Faith is in sore need of exposition. It is a surprise and a joy to read in the writings of a Jew an understanding of what Faith means in the Gospels. In his most recent book,

³ Henry T. Hodgkin in *Problems of To-morrow*.

⁴ A. Clutton-Brock, *Studies in Christianity*, 80.

⁵ George Hooper in *Problems of To-morrow*.

⁶ E. T. Campagnac, *Religion and Religious Teaching*, 87.

¹ Quiller-Couch, *Studies in Literature*, 23, 92, 107, 112.

² A. Clutton-Brock in *Faith and Freedom*, 263, 294.

Liberal Judaism and Hellenism, Mr. Claude G. Montefiore says: 'If the teaching of Jesus is prophetic in its passion, it is prophetic too in that unqualified and limitless trust or faith in God, by which English words we seek to translate the Greek word "*Pistis*." That faith, as Jesus used the term, was not faith in himself, or belief in any theological propositions as to his nature or his office, but it was primarily faith in *God*, and only secondarily faith in God's messenger and servant which Jesus conceived himself to be. It is the same spiritual quality which is extolled and enjoined by the Psalmists: confidence in God, in His rule, His righteousness, His wisdom. But the quality, the virtue, is deepened, as Jesus uses the term. By faith he seems to mean a spiritual power, a confidence which enables men to *do* things that otherwise they could not do, that lifts them, as we say, above themselves. But it is also a confidence that God will help them to do things, that He will give them strength to do things, and therefore that they will be enabled to do them. And, lastly, this confidence or trust, when it is evoked, appears to be regenerative; it can be the basis and beginning of a new moral life: it turns the heart towards goodness: it gives the power to the will to quit the life of sin and to begin the life of virtue. Justly may the past sins of a man, who has begun to have faith, be forgiven, because by the strength of that faith he will be enabled to overcome his sinful tendency and to free himself from its bondage. Is not this doctrine psychologically true? If a man has any right and ardent conviction about God, either, for instance, that God will surely help him, or that God greatly desires his repentance, this conviction can become a power unto him, enabling him, on the one hand, to conquer his sin and, on the other hand, to fulfil the commands of God. Faith causes works and precedes them. It can be a saving faith, leading both to noble action and to happy peace. This seems the doctrine not so much taught as *implied* in that frequent laudation of "faith" which we meet with in the sayings of Jesus. And this doctrine seems good and true, and only an extension and a deepening of doctrine which is already taught within the pages of the Hebrew Scriptures.'

Mr. Montefiore's exposition of Faith in the Gospels needs finishing off. It omits the miracles. Take that in from Dr. Anderson Scott's *Dominus Noster*: 'In some cases He acknowledged its

presence: in others its absence is noted as preventing the working of miracles. But this "faith" was not belief in Himself as this or that; it was an attitude towards Himself of confidence and expectancy, a readiness to receive, not alone the physical boon, but the boon and the message, the revelation of which the miracle would be the vehicle. Men who had taken up such an attitude to Jesus were thereby in such relation to Him that His power could be manifested on their behalf without danger of its being regarded merely as a demonstration, a boon without meaning beyond itself.'

Rhythm.

All manual or bodily labour is enormously increased in effect, when timed to rhythm. So a regiment marches to a band; so the tramp of a column crossing a light bridge has to be broken lest the timed impact wreck the structure; so in the Peninsular War a British regiment heaved down a wall apparently immovable, by lining against it and applying bodily pressure in successive rhythmical waves. So I, who have lived most of my life over a harbour, have seen and heard crews weighing anchor at windlass or capstan, or hauling on ropes, to a sailors' chanty, the solo-man intoning

We have a good ship and a jolly good crew!
the chorus taking him up

And away, away Rio!¹

A Debt to the Dead.

I am profoundly conscious of the grave practical difficulties which the policy I advocate would involve. Its adoption, more especially with regard to the fixing of minimum wages, would impose a heavy burden upon all those responsible for the conduct of industrial life, and agriculture would confront a yet more intricate problem. Yet I venture to submit, in all seriousness, that the nation must choose either difficulty or disaster. I submit that the day is past in which we could afford to compromise between the desires of the few and the needs of the many, or to perpetuate conditions in which large masses of the people are unable to secure the bare necessities of mental and physical efficiency. I submit that when the war is over, with its record of infinite sacrifice, it

¹ Quiller-Couch, *Studies in Literature*, 25.

will leave us not only with huge monetary obligations, but with a debt to the dead which must be paid to the living, in terms of life and health and opportunity. We cannot refuse to discharge that supreme debt.¹

Alors—it moves.

If I ever thought I could change the conviction of a French peasant, I don't think so since I have lived among them. I spent several days last summer trying to convince Père that the sun did not go round the earth. I drew charts of the heavens—you should have seen them—and explained the solar system. He listened attentively—one has to listen when the *patronne* talks, you know—and I thought he understood. When it was all over—it took me three days—he said to me: '*Bien*. All the same, look at the sun. This morning it was behind Maria's house over there. I saw it. At noon it was right over my orchard. I saw it there. At five o'clock it will be behind the hill at Esbly. You tell me it does not move! Why, I see it move every day.' *Alors—it moves.*²

God's in His Heaven.

There are many men for whom God has gone from His heaven because they cannot find an ancient and venerable form of words (the same perhaps as we ourselves have been wont to repeat) adequate to embrace and keep in coherent order the tumultuous warring facts of life as it is to-day. Gone, I said, from His heaven—but not that; gone rather from *their* heaven, *i.e.* from the heaven in which *they* used to find Him; retreated now into a vaster realm, in which they cannot now find Him, but may at last find Him, after much searching and long and painful travelling.³

Purgatory.

It is said of Armelle Nicolas, the maidservant and mystic, whose biography has just been translated into English, that: 'Among the graces which God bestowed on her in her tender youth, one of the most important from the effects it produced, was the giving her a clear knowledge of the sufferings of Souls in Purgatory. This knowledge was vividly impressed on her mind, without her know-

ing by whom, nor how: but she felt a great compassion for these poor Souls and a very great desire to be able to help them. Therefore all the good works she did, or the pains she endured, were all directed to that end. If in the heats of summer while minding her sheep she was oppressed by the heat, or by the cold in winter, she rejoiced that by this means she might relieve her brothers (for thus she used to call the Souls in Purgatory). If she had to sweep, or perform the hardest work in the house, it was with the same intention. Often she exposed herself to the heat of the sun, or to that of a great fire, holding out as long as she could, in order to diminish what they endure. At her meals she deprived herself of what she liked best, often of everything, to give it in alms to the poor, with this same intention. She used to say to herself as a stimulus to helping them, 'If I saw one of my relations in a great fire from which he could not get out, and that I was able to get him out, should I not be very cruel to leave him burn there and suffer? How much more then should I assist the Souls of my own brothers, who are cruelly tormented and cannot help themselves.'

That passage 'leaves to think,' as Dr. Rendel Harris would say.

Specializing.

For company I have an occasional commercial traveller. They are a strange race, knowing as a rule only one subject, such as leather, or coals, or the insides of watches, or whisky; and even on these subjects their knowledge is limited to the prices of varying qualities. And although, by their wandering life and frequent dealings with men, they might be supposed to know something of human nature, their sole aim seems to be to find out and recollect ever after what weakness each embodiment of said human nature is most liable to. So to one man they rail at Voluntaryism in a superficial way, to another they narrate the most authentic gossip, to a third they offer 'a stiff one,' or, as they facetiously call it, 'a bottle of lemonade.' To me, after they have found out my line, they lament the low state of commercial morality, of which their previous revelations of their own business afford as a rule most ample illustration. Some of them are singularly decent fellows, and all have a push and go about them that make me feel very stupid.⁴

¹ B. S. Rowntree, *The Human Needs of Labour*, 144.

² M. Aldrich, *On the Edge of the War Zone*, 146.

³ E. T. Campagnac, *Religion and Religious Teaching*, 47.

⁴ *Life and Letters of John Paterson Struthers, M.A.*, 91.

Time and Place.

Miss Jex-Blake visited Emerson when she was in America. She says: 'Mrs. Emerson talked a little about "women's questions," female franchise, etc.—and spoke of the wonderful blinding power of habit,—as in slavery question,—looking to Christianity in its advance to set all to rights. I remarked that few had done more harm to the cause than St. Paul by some of his words. She replied very truly that the fault lay rather in those who would rigidly apply such words and consider them binding out of all connection of time and place.'¹

The Trinity.

We do not see the real meaning of the doctrine of the Trinity, namely, that personality exists only in relation to other personality, and that, if God were alone, He would be inferior to man as He would be lacking in personality. Therefore, if God exists, He is not alone, but a society; and the Athanasian Creed is not a mere lunacy of logic but an effort to express this paradox, with a little bad temper caused by the difficulty of expressing it. But if God is a social being in His relation to God, He is social also in His relation to man. His desire is to rescue, not individual men only, but the society of mankind, of the universe. His desire is that all men shall be possessed by His Grace; nor is it possible for any one man to be possessed by it fully until all are possessed by it.²

His Vocal Organs.

Every literature being written in a language—every great literature commanding a masterly style of its own language and appealing to an almost infinitely delicate acquaintance with its meanings, an almost infinitely delicate sense of its sounds, even to semi-tones and demi-semi-tones—no foreigner can ever quite penetrate to the last excellence of an unfamiliar tongue. I know this to be a hard saying: and I utter it very reluctantly because it is wormwood to me to own myself congenitally debarred—though it be in common with all modern men—from entering the last shrine of beauty (say) in a chorus of Sophocles. But I am sure that it is so. Lovely as we may

divine the thrill to be (or rather to have been for those who have ears to hear)—educative as it may be even in tantalizing our thirst—I am sure that no modern Englishman can ever quite reach back to the lilt of a Sophoclean chorus; still less to its play of vowel notes. I doubt even if by taking most careful thought he can attain to the last beauties of a sonnet by Leconte de Lisle or Heredia.

You may urge that, Latin and Greek being dead languages which we are agreed in various ways to mispronounce, this disability may apply to them, but does not extend to our modern Babel. I answer, first, that if only by structure of his vocal organs a German is congenitally unable to read our poetry; that his eye, perusing it, cannot translate it to any part of him capable of reproducing its finest sound. The late Philip Gilbert Hamerton once illustrated this from a few lines of Tennyson's *Claribel*:

Where Claribel low-lieth
The breezes pause and die,
Letting the rose-leaves fall: . . .
At eve the beetle boometh
Athwart the thicket lone: . . .
The hollow grot replieth
Where Claribel low-lieth.

Now to an English critic with a musical ear the whole consonantal secret of that little poem resides in the labials, with their suggestion of moonlit lapsing water, and the low 'th' sounds in which one feels the very breath of eve softly wafted:

At eve the beetle boometh
Athwart the thicket lone.

But a German simply cannot compass the soft 'th' sound. He *has* to introduce his own harsh hiss upon the twilit quiet where never a full sibilant was allowed. As this:

At eve ze beedle boomess
Aswart ze zickhead lon;

while as for the continuous hushed run of the soft guttural to lip and tooth ('Claribel,' 'throistle,' 'thick-leaved ambrosial,' 'the hollow grot') he must rest content with his ancestral habit which has not yet evolved even labials beyond the throat: 'Sick-leaved ambhrosial':

Ze hollo ghrot hrepliez
Hwhere Chlaribel hlow hliez.³

¹ *The Life of Sophia Jex-Blake*, 166.

² A. Clutton-Brock, *Studies in Christianity*, 130.

³ Quiller-Couch, *Studies in Literature*, 310.

Social Shame.

The great revival of religion which ushered in the public ministry of Jesus seems to have come to Him, as to thousands of others, as a call to repentance. Scholars have cast about for some explanation why He, the sinless, underwent John's baptism of remission. John was preaching corporate righteousness for Israel, appealing to men in their callings as soldiers, tax-farmers, religious leaders, to change their minds that they might fit in to the new order which God was about to set up in their nation. Is not the simplest explanation that Jesus felt, and felt far more keenly than any other, social shame and a craving for the new life of His people with their God? To-day, whether burdened or not with a sense of personal wrongdoing, men are faced with the frightful results of corporate transgression. God's judgments on national greed, on trust in organized brute might, on contempt for Christlike love, are abroad in the earth, and have come home in unutterable suffering to millions of hearts. The guilt for this must be brought home as personally.

We are all diseased,
And with our surfeiting and wanton hours
Have brought ourselves into a burning fever,
And we must bleed for it.¹

NOTES ON TEXTS.**Exod. iii. 5.**

'Put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.' The most pathetic thing I have seen on all the battle front was a solitary soldier's grave. It was different from all others because it was absolutely alone. The man had died on the march and was buried by the roadside. A simple cross marked the place. The country around was flat and dreary, and not a human habitation within sight. Truly he lies there in lonely glory, but there is no gain-saying the glory.²

Psalm iv. 8.

I have had such a happy, holy evening with two or three of the girls. . . . And God seemed to give me such wonderful power to help them, and I believe He has helped them. And in all this—I know not how, but I wake up at their departing . . . to find that somehow God has rolled away my burden utterly. I had forgotten it and myself altogether, and now I can find neither. I can hardly believe in the pain and misery of the morning, it seems a dim, far-off memory. I do not know when I could so fully and entirely say, 'I

will lay me down *in peace* and sleep, for Thou, Lord, only makest me to dwell in safety.'³

John xxi. 20.

'That disciple which leaned back on His breast at supper' (R.V.). I like the text very much. John lay and looked up the way a child does on its mother's knee. Christ had a dreadful hour before Him, and John didn't understand it, and yet Christ let him lean his head on His breast. And years after, when Christ was in glory, He makes John write down that bit about 'leaning his head,' as if He wanted to show He was not ashamed to be called his Friend as well as his God. That was the closest man ever came to Christ—except when Judas kissed Him—and it is the hour of John's highest honour, but it was also the hour of his sorest trial. Christ was to be betrayed by Judas. We get nearest Christ when we are partakers of His sufferings, or, at least, we have to get near Him then in order to be sharers of His glory afterwards.⁴

Psalm cxvii.

The Psalm that came in course was the 117th, the shortest chapter in the Bible, and also the middle one—594 before it, and 594 after it; and it is full of praise. I said it was like a commanding ridge from which we looked back on all the chapters of past providence and forward on all to come, and there was eternal truth and loving-kindness. It was the Psalm Cromwell's men sang when the Scotch were defeated at Dunbar. I said it might, by God's grace, commemorate Christ's victory over us; like the rock Meloria, of which the Genoese Admiral said, 'A defeat rendered it famous; a victory would render it immortal.'⁴

RECENT POETRY.**Henry Newbolt.**

The little volume, *St. George's Day* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net), contains some at any rate of our favourites. It contains 'Sacramentum Supremum' and 'Farewell.' It also contains 'The Toy Band,' a fine version of that strange moving story of the drummer who found himself and his company without heart or hope or any band instruments and bought a toy drum (or was it a penny whistle?) and led the men triumphantly into the battle again.

Bertram Lloyd.

Mr. Bertram Lloyd is the editor of a volume of *Poems Written during the Great War, 1914-1918* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). They are peace

³ *The Life of Sophia Jex-Blake*, 97.

⁴ *Life and Letters of John Paterson Struthers, M.A.*, 150, 152.

¹ H. S. Coffin, *In a Day of Social Rebuilding*, 65.

² J. A. Patten, *The Decoration of the Cross*, 133.

poems, some would call them pacifist. They are poems to drive to thinking. Take this by A. E.:

TRAGEDY.

This, of all fates, would be the saddest end,
That that heroic fever, with its cry
From Children unto Mother, 'Here am I!'
Should lose the very faith it would defend;
That the high soul through passion should descend
To work the evil it had willed must die.
If it won so, would that be victory,
That tragic close? Oh, hearken, foe or friend,
Love, the magician, and the wizard Hate,*
Though one be like white fire, and one, dark flame,
Work the same miracle, and all are wrought
Into the image that they contemplate.
None ever hated in the world but came
To every baseness of the foe he fought.

Lance-Corporal Cobber.

Mr. A. St. John Adcock edits this book entitled *The Anzac Pilgrim's Progress* (Simpkin; 3s. 6d. net). His editing consists of a note in which he tells us that he is not allowed to tell us anything about Lance-Corporal Cobber (not even his Christian name?), but that we may learn something if we read between the lines of the poems themselves. The poems, then, are autobiographical. The first poem describes how the news of the War came to Australia in August 1914, and how Mr. Cobber enlisted. The next how, after much tribulation, he was made into a soldier. Another, how his regiment marched out of camp on the way to embark. But it is time we had quoted a poem. Let us quote this one. It is called

UNDER ORDERS.

The pick of ancient bouncers, both Greek and Roman too,
Were sons of gods an' took no odds as common mortals do;
Whenever they were cornered or worsted in a fray
Their parents came in cloud or flame an' sloped them safe away.
It's easy to be heroes when gods are loafin' round
To help you slap the other chap an' keep you safe an' sound,
But we don't git the luxuries they gave to heroes then:
We're the mortal man Australian—we're men, an' sons of men.

*But we're comin', Kaiser Bill,
We are comin', Kaiser Bill,
When you see our Emu feather
You can look for stormy weather,*

We are comin' all together, ripe an' ready for a mill:

Some with feathers, some with none,

Every man a fighting one—

We are out to set things hummin'

When we come, and we are comin',

We are comin', comin', comin', Kaiser Bill!

We're not *your* brand o' swaddy, machine-made goose-step things

That have to fight if, out o' sight, you choose to pull the strings;

We rule our kings, we're freemen, who call their souls their own,

Not serfs that must go stouchin' just because a bugle's blown;

We know, for we're no dillys on guff and guyver fed,

The reason why we do or die before we're done or dead;

We know that Deutschland über alles would not sit light an' soft

An' we'll take care she's never there—until she goes aloft!

Not rattled, bullied conscripts, no War Lord we obeyed:

We tilled the soil, or used to toil in every kind of trade

As grocers, stockmen, miners, as lawyers, peaceful blokes.

Who perched on stools or taught in schools, as shop an' factory folks,

As axemen, artists, writers, as coves that printed books,

As bushmen, bakers, undertakers, actors, chemists, cooks—

But we've chucked the desk, the bench, the store, the paint-pot and the pen,

Hammer an' plough, an' we're soldiers now, and fust-class fighting-men.

And we're comin', Kaiser Bill,

We are comin', Kaiser Bill!

You have set the drum a-rattle,

So we've done with crops an' cattle,

If you're wantin' bloody battle, Gawd, but you shall have yer fill!

'Fore you boss the earth, ole toff,

We'll be there to shove you off—

We have done with schools an' summin',

Done with shearin', clerkin', plumbin',

And we're comin', comin', comin', Kaiser Bill!

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Pelmanism and Peace.

BY ARTHUR F. THORN, AUTHOR OF 'RICHARD JEFFERIES AND CIVILISATION,'
'SOCIAL SATIRES,' ETC.

THE truth that civilization has been strained almost to breaking point by the war will not be denied by those who are able to recall the cataclysmic events of the past four and a half years. Nothing less than a revolution has taken place in society, but its progress has been too gradual for immediate realization; these spectacular horrors of modern warfare have largely detracted the public consciousness from the social changes which have come about as a result of world conflict, but when peace comes these things will need to be appreciated in their true perspectives. The future will consist mainly of social problems that will demand the concentrated mental effort of every individual brain. Vital national issues directly affecting the lives of the people will demand serious consideration and successful treatment, not only by a few men of genius, but by the people themselves. There will be a vacuum in the social atmosphere that will draw all mentalities into its vortex, and if those mentalities are insufficiently equipped for the strain which will be put upon them, then the wisest plans of the minority will prove ineffectual.

How few are able to grasp mentally the significance of the present moment, or to visualize the intensely dramatic possibilities of the near future! How few are able to perceive that the war has, in the sense of destruction, set civilization back a century, and that it will be absolutely necessary to repair the wreckage as soon as possible after peace is declared! The emotional reaction of joy that will inevitably succeed the birth of peace will, for a time, subordinate every other public emotion. One can quite clearly visualize a condition of happy chaos that will laugh in the face of serious thought and be quite unable to appreciate the fact that grave danger still threatens civilization; that nothing short of collective intelligence and collective thinking will assure a sane future for democracy. The future needs thought as the human body needs food; it needs dynamic ideas and ideals; it needs effectively applied mental science,

and it needs human understanding. The failure of the past to secure for the people a general high standard of living and social security which might leave man free to become aware of his higher mental self; this failure has been due to the absence of collective thought—the failure, in fact, of the average undeveloped mind. Let us examine this question closely. Great ideals and schemes for the betterment of mankind have been conceived and expressed by thinkers whose sole motive was the uplifting of their fellow-men. They had no axe to grind—men like Ruskin, William Morris, Tolstoi, Emerson, and many others, whose life-work was directed towards the elevation of mankind. These great men were not in themselves failures; they expressed their ideals very clearly; it is humanity that has failed, not the men of genius who have pointed a way to emancipation. Why have these mental pioneers been unable to produce a full and satisfactory result? Why has humanity failed to utilize the ideals of its great teachers? There is no excuse for humanity; *humanity has consistently refused to think; it has neglected its mind; failed to realize the importance of ideas, and, in so doing, has allowed the paralyzing forces of ignorance to overwhelm it.* False dignity cannot point a flaw in this argument; it is as clear as the sun in mid-heaven.

Thought, rightly directed and intelligently applied to the complex problems of human life, can alone lift the race beyond the devastating effects of mental apathy and intellectual inertia. We have neglected our brains; we have failed to apprehend the infinite power of mind, and we suffer in consequence. Then, it will at once be said, education is also a failure. What has education been doing all these years? What is wrong with our educational system that the average person is not, in the highest sense of the word, educated? The answer is, that educationists have been much too anxious to provide a utilitarian education; an education purposely designed to fit in with conven-

tional ideas of life, and with things as they are. Educationists have not properly appreciated the fact of individual psychology. Conventional education may impart much valuable technical knowledge, and, at the same time, fail to draw out those vital qualities of personal initiative and individual thought which are alone able to develop the pupil's highest potentialities. The result of such education is not a mind alive to the colour and joyous possibilities of life, but a mind encumbered with a certain mechanical arrangement of facts that are, within limits, quite useful, but which are also narrowly restricted, and do not as a rule enable the individual to become intimate with the possibilities of his or her own unique personality.

The whole problem of the future, in which it is generally admitted that reconstruction shall be the most important task, is a problem which involves the mental response of the people to the idea of reconstruction in all its phases. People in all classes of society will need to think and analyze for themselves; they will have to discuss national affairs and bring their minds to bear intelligently upon the various aspects of social reconstruction. They will have to be mentally awake not only to their own personal interests, but also to the interests of others. The future will demand a clarified perception of right values and sane ideals; it will need clear, energetic brains and sensitive imaginations—mental qualities which do not develop without systematic exercise and rightly directed interest and concentration. The need for the healthy activity of these mental faculties exists increasingly, and the Pelman System of Mind and Memory Training has evolved side by side with this need. The Pelman System of mental education is nothing more nor less than a proved developer of every healthy and progressive activity of the human mind. There would appear to be no other system of Mind and Memory Training more likely to stimulate the latent powers of the undeveloped brain and prepare it for the intense intellectual battles of the future. The Pelman System invariably produces that requisite mental vitality and keen perception that can alone prove successful in a world fighting for existence with ideas. The Pelman System is more scientific and more certain of its ground than any other system which claims to provide an incentive to thought, and a stimulus to imagination. It has psychology for its basis, whereas conventional education regards psychology as a mere branch of mental science, and does not normally include it in the popular curriculum. This oversight has caused the failure of conventional education just as the recognition of the psychological basis of

mental life has proved the success of the Pelman System.

Briefly, then, the coming of peace will demand collective thinking; it will demand the serious consideration of, and creation of, ideas; it will demand intelligence. Nothing less than efficiently educated brains will be qualified to deal with those supreme national issues which must affect the race generally. Nothing short of national mental education will be of any practical value in the enormous task of social reconstruction. Pelmanism will play a much greater part in the shaping of our national future than many of us imagine. The world cannot become safe for the people and for posterity until each individual unit in society fully realizes the possibilities of their own particular mentality and its power over the conditions of life which form its environment. The hopes which mental education holds out for the future are stupendous. There is no limit to the happy possibilities of the future if only humanity will collectively realize the divine potentialities of thought, and awaken to the necessity of creating a condition of human life which shall bless the children of to-morrow and justify the sacrifice and sorrow of to-day.

* * * * *

What *Truth* says:

'The first point which emerges in a survey of the present position of the Pelman Institute is . . . that recognition is being more and more recorded to its educational activities by men and women interested in the improvement of the intellectual fibre of the nation and the resultant increase in national efficiency. The judgment passed by *Truth* has been upheld by every judge who has examined the facts for himself, and, be it added, by a jury of unexampled magnitude, which has come to the same conclusion through personal experience.

'Allusion has already been made to the amazing increase in the number of men and women who have taken, or are taking, the Pelman Course of instruction. The number of students on the Pelman Roll to-day has passed the 250,000* mark, and of those a very large proportion have enrolled within the past two years. From no one of these students has *Truth* heard a single word of discontent or a suggestion that any of the conclusions arrived at are misleading or fallacious, though those conclusions in a large proportion of recent enrolments were probably a determining factor.'

* Now 400,000.

* * * * *

• '*Mind and Memory*' (in which the Pelman Course is fully described, with a Synopsis of the lessons) will be sent, gratis and post free, together with a full reprint of '*Truth's*' famous Report on the Pelman System, and a form entitling readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to the complete Course for one-third less than the usual fee, on application to the Pelman Institute, 212 Pelman House, Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C. 1.